

Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1719. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on deficiencies in the administration of Government quarters, messing facilities, and military leave at Dow Air Force Base, Maine, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1720. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434), and the act approved June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 377); to the Committee on House Administration.

1721. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Office of Coal Research relating to coal research activities undertaken during calendar year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1722. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of Philip N. Shepherdson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1723. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to repeal the provisions of law codified in 5 U.S.C. 39, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9903. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and to implement more fully the national transportation policy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10005. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 10006. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 10007. A bill to authorize national banks to make certain redevelopment loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10008. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the redevelopment by private persons of property in the downtown business districts of our cities by allowing the cost of such rede-

velopment to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10009. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Small Business Administration to assist small-business concerns in obtaining leases of property in downtown business districts by providing insurance for such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 10010. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require that a judge of a U.S. district court shall be a resident of the district for which he is appointed at least 3 years immediately prior to the time of his appointment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10011. A bill to create a U.S. Botanical Survey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 10012. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 10013. A bill to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 10014. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 10015. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 10016. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for certain former Members of Congress with 50 years of continuous active service in Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 926. Joint resolution to provide that information relating to the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy shall be made public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Res. 626. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study of moving the Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of the West Virginia House of Delegates requesting studies by appropriate Federal and State agencies of the current forest management practices which obtain in the Monongahela National Forest and a change in policy of that management; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the assembly of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make a full investigation to deter-

mine whether or not it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 10017. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Panagopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10018. A bill for the relief of Mario Barbat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10019. A bill for the relief of Santino Pinto, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10020. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dvora Eisenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 10021. A bill for the relief of Farida Hanna Hazbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10022. A bill for the relief of Ricardo G. Mangacat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

706. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to investigate certain radio-TV news releases relative to alleged limited circulation of remarks by the President concerning friendly nations trading with Communist Cuba, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1964)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of our spirits, who hearest prayer, and to whom all flesh shall come, breathe now upon our waiting hearts, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm.

Not only in moments of blessed quietness, with raucous sounds shut out, may we hear Thy summons, but also in the thunder of these tumultuous days of destiny may we be conscious that Thy voice to us is calling.

As from this historic Chamber the panorama of the Nation's life in all the yesterdays passes before our eyes and minds, may we here highly resolve that this white-domed Capitol edifice shall be not only an arsenal of material might, but also a cathedral of faith where are proclaimed to all the earth the sanctions of irresistible moral force and of spiritual verities upon which our freedoms

were reared, on which they rest, and without which our boasted democracy is but a bruised and broken reed.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 17, 1964, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS—LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, being filled with charity and compassion, I shall not object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the working capital funds of that Department, dated June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PRICE DIFFERENTIAL IN SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND STATE OF MARYLAND

A letter from the Comptroller of the Treasury, for the State of Maryland, Annapolis, Md., relating to the price differential in the sale of alcoholic beverages in the District of Columbia as compared with sales in the State of Maryland (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON DEFICIENCIES IN ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN QUARTERS AND MILITARY LEAVE AT DOW AIR FORCE BASE, MAINE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report on deficiencies in administration of Government quarters, messing facilities, and military leave at Dow Air Force Base, Maine, Department of the Air Force, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

UNCLASSIFIED LETTER OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an unclassified letter, which transmitted a secret report on ineffective program planning and uneconomical utilization of personnel assigned to the Air Force reserve recovery program (January 1964, B-146831), Department of the Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNECONOMICAL REPLACEMENT OF VEHICLES BY THE U.S. 5TH AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical replacement of vehicles by the U.S. 5th Air Force, Fuchu Air Station, Japan, Department of the Air Force, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS TO MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR TRAVEL OF DEPENDENTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improper payments to military personnel for travel of dependents, Department of the Army, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CHELAN DIVISION, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Chelan Division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claims of certain Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that fund, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by General Joseph Wheeler Post No. 62, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jersey City, N.J., favoring the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mary Koehler, of Mobile, Ala., relating to the enactment of the civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution passed by the general assembly of the State of South Carolina requesting the President of the United States to take necessary action to protect the woolen industry of the United States from encroaching imports of foreign woolen products.

On behalf of my colleague the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD together with my remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take such action as necessary to protect the woolen industry of this country

Whereas between 1947 and 1962 the wool textile industry in the United States has lost (1) over 100,000 jobs; (2) about 300 plants or establishments; (3) 21,836 broadlooms; (4) 2,169,000 spindles; (5) 1,042 combs; and (6) approximately 60 percent of the machinery used in the industry; and

Whereas it appears that the loss trend will continue unless appropriate action is taken by the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas these losses are adversely affecting communities on a nationwide basis; and

Whereas it has been previously determined by acts of Congress and opinions of those connected with defense mobilization that an adequate wool textile industry is essential to national security; and

Whereas the late President John F. Kennedy declared, on May 2, 1961, that "It [the textile industry] is of vital importance in peacetime and it has direct effect upon our total economy"; and

Whereas it is recommended by those with peculiar knowledge of the industry to the President of the United States that—

1. Wool product duties be reserved from the negotiating list scheduled to begin in May under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

2. The Government urgently and unremittably pursue solution of the wool product import problem through international negotiations and accord; or, failing that;

3. The Government act unilaterally to restrain wool product imports to prevent market disruption and to restore and foster fair competition to avert the liquidation of an essential industry; and

Whereas the members of the General Assembly of South Carolina share in the concern for the future of the woolen industry and wish to convey this concern to the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to take such steps as is necessary to protect the woolen industry of this country and urgently recommend that the President act in the following more specific manner:

1. That wool product duties be reserved from the negotiating list scheduled to begin in May under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

2. That the Government urgently and unremittently pursue solution of the wool product import problem through international negotiations and accord; or, failing that;

3. That the Government act unilaterally to restrain wool product imports to prevent market disruption and to restore and foster fair competition to avert the liquidation of an essential industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Member of the congressional districts from South Carolina, and to the Honorable Edwin Wilkinson, president, National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

[SEAL]

CIVIL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Republican Committee, favoring the enactment of House bill 7152, relating to civil rights.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE

Whereas the Republican Party had its origin in contention for human rights and the dignity and worth of the individual; and

Whereas the 1960 civil rights platform of the District of Columbia Republican Committee declared that "We shall not compromise on these fundamental rights of American citizens as guaranteed by our Constitution"; and

Whereas the leadership of the two national political parties has agreed that action on the civil rights bill now under consideration before the Congress should receive nonpartisan support; and

Whereas Republicans in Congress historically have consistently outvoted the Democrats in proportion to their strength on civil rights issues since 1933, and Republican Congressman WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio, in cooperation with other Republican Members of Congress, has produced Republican majorities on vital amendments to the 1964 civil rights legislation under consideration in Congress, we urge the Republican Party to help insure passage of said bill at an early time; and

Whereas such support will, as it should, remove the question of civil rights from the area of partisan political debate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Republican Committee does fully endorse and support the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, now pending before the Congress, with any

modification which shall give increased assurance of the recognition of the dignity of the human personality; and be it further

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Republican Committee does recommend and urge all Republican Members of the Congress to give their full endorsement and support of H.R. 7152; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Republican Members of the Congress.

FRED L. DIXON,
Secretary.

FEBRUARY 12, 1964.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION TO REVIEW CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Association of County Officers of the State of New York approving the enactment of House bill 6202, granting appellate jurisdiction to review certain determinations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE COUNTY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Whereas it is a fundamental principle of our system of government that our courts should always have appellate jurisdiction to review the determination, ruling, and decisions of all public officials, departments, and commissions; and

Whereas this principle is founded upon precedent that no such public official, department, or commission should ever be permitted to assume dictatorial powers; and

Whereas such principle tends to prevent centralization of power in such a public official, department, or commission or in any unit of government whether local, State, or National; and

Whereas the determination of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the Federal Government is not reviewable by the courts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Association of County Officers of the State of New York records its approval of bill H.R. 6202 which would grant appellate jurisdiction to our courts to review such determinations; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive director be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the New York State Senators and Congressmen and to the National Association of Counties.

Attest:

C. L. CHAMBERLAIN,
Executive Director.

Dated February 3, 1964.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic;

William Attwood, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Kenya;

James D. Bell, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malaysia;

Robert G. Barnes, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; and

G. McMurtrie Godley, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Congo.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2513. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl E. Halverson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2514. A bill for the relief of Key Suck Yang; and

S. 2515. A bill for the relief of David Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2516. A bill to permit the prepayment of FHA-insured mortgages without requiring the payment of an adjusted premium charge in certain cases involving nonprofit educational institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2517. A bill for the relief of Vicenzo Pultano; and

S. 2518. A bill for the relief of Phyllis Mayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2519. A bill for the relief of Zehra Ener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF MOVING THE ROME AIR MATERIEL AREA FROM GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, ROME, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 298) to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study of moving the Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KEATING, which appears under a separate heading.)

JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO, OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT, PRESENTS WELL-REASONED PLAN FOR PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the subject of Presidential inability and succession is one that has engaged the attention of the Congress and the Nation's citizens for a century or longer. Interest was always keenest, of course, when, because of some current break, or seeming break, in the continuity of Presidential power, doubts arose as to

the depository of Presidential constitutional authority.

I recall to you the melancholy period when President James A. Garfield was, because of an assassin's bullet, incapacitated for 80 days prior to his death. No authoritative official or body could or would declare that he was unable to attend to the duties of the Chief Executive. As a consequence, we drifted without a responsible hand in the White House for nearly 3 months. The equally painful period is remembered when President Woodrow Wilson, suffering from a paralytic stroke, was unable to fully discharge the momentous duties of his office for 18 months. Thomas Marshall, his Vice President, was willing to assume the responsibilities of the Presidency but President Wilson would not relinquish his authority. He, in fact, dismissed his Secretary of State when that official, concerned for the affairs of the Nation, called a meeting of the Cabinet. So obdurate was President Wilson in this whole regretful situation that he had, it is contended, his physician publicly declare he would never certify to the disability of the President. Never must we be placed in such an equivocal light before the world.

I have today introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which, if adopted will, I confidently believe, prevent the repetition of the Garfield, Wilson, and other equally unfortunate situations. This amendment to our Constitution will solve the problem of presidential inability and succession and, at the same time, place the Office of Vice President in the setting of dignity and responsibility which it deserves.

In view of the many plans which have been submitted to Congress on this subject, I am naming this proposal the "Musmanno Plan." Its author is Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, a personal friend of mine for a quarter of a century, who has devoted many years of study to the subject. As late as February 1958, the noted jurist testified before Senator Kefauver's Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and as long ago as 1929 he wrote a book entitled "Proposed Constitutional Amendments."

Justice Musmanno's plan in essence is as follows: The House and Senate Judiciary Committees will constitute a permanent Commission on Prevention of Lapse of Executive Power. This committee will be subject to call at all times, whether Congress is in session or not, by the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The committee, when summoned, will decide by a two-thirds majority whether a President, in the event he is apparently disabled or unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office for any reason, is in fact so disabled or unable. You will note the use of the word "unable" here, in addition to "disable," the reason being that there can be a state of facts where the President, although physically able to perform his duties, may be inaccessible as, for instance, in the event of a plane misfortune which could land him in the ocean, in a jungle, or on a desert.

Having declared a Presidential disability or inability to serve, the Commission on Prevention of Lapse of Executive Power would decide later, also by a two-thirds majority, when the inability or disability will have ceased.

This plan, it appears to me, is reasonable, just, workable, and wholly democratic. It places in the hands of representatives of the people the serious business of transferring the highest national executive power to an individual other than the President. Many of the plans which have been suggested are fraught with fallacy, danger, and impracticality. For instance, I would not favor the plan which recommends that the Vice President himself declare when he should supersede the Presidency. No person in a representative democracy should be allowed, by his own determination, to displace a higher official.

Nor do I care for the plan which leaves it to the Cabinet to determine whether the President is able to perform his duties. The Cabinet, being composed of Presidential appointees, might have a difficult time making a decision wholly unrelated to their sense of intimacy with the President.

Other plans invest the Supreme Court or a commission headed by the Chief Justice with authority to decide questions on Presidential inability. It would be a mistake to have the Supreme Court determine this delicate question because if litigation should result, the Supreme Court would find itself in the awkward position of having to pass on its own actions or the action of the Chief Justice.

The Musmanno plan is simple, direct and, I repeat, wholly democratic, in resolving the problem of presidential inability which has worried lawmakers and students of government for many decades. This plan goes further and provides for the election of a Second Vice President when the Vice President shall have succeeded the President, permanently or only temporarily.

Under the Musmanno plan we would today have a Vice President. The procedure for the filling of that office, when it becomes vacant, is, like all the provisions in this plan, very simple. The national committee of the political party, of which the President is a member, would submit to Congress the names of three persons qualified for the Presidency; and Congress would elect one of these three persons as Vice President.

In order not to provide for a Second Vice President when the President will, obviously, be disabled for a very short period, the Musmanno plan provides that there shall be no second Vice President unless the vacancy is quite clearly not to endure for 6 months or more.

And now I come to perhaps the most unique feature of the Musmanno plan. Under this proposed constitutional amendment the Vice President would no longer be a member of the legislative department of the Government. He would become, as, of course, he essentially is, a member of the executive department and would be subject to the orders and direction of the President at all times, functioning, indeed, in the

President's stead when the President desired to delegate certain presidential functions to him. This delegation of power could only be done in writing and would last only as long as the President wished it to last.

We concede that the President has too many burdens to carry. He, of course, shall always be the leader of the Nation in every field of government, security, and well-being of the American people, but he should be allowed to delegate to the Vice President, from time to time, ministerial tasks which rob him of time and do not necessarily require solomonic decision. As Justice Musmanno said when he testified before the Kefauver committee:

As of the present moment the President could not even constitutionally delegate his power to sign important documents in the event some accident disabled his writing hand.

And then there are moments in the life of the Nation when momentous decisions must be made regardless of the accessibility of the President. To quote Justice Musmanno again:

When President Eisenhower underwent surgery at the Walter Reed Hospital for ileitis, he was under anesthesia, according to a signed article in the Washington Post February 2, for 4 hours. It is frightening to contemplate that if during this period the United States had suffered an atomic or missile attack, there would have been no Commander in Chief to coordinate defense, counterattack, and civilian evacuation. He did ready United States defense forces for emergency before taking the anesthesia.

Under the Musmanno plan the President could delegate his powers for an hour, a minute, or for whatever period a crisis might call for. Again quoting the Justice:

The President, before entering the hospital, for instance, for major surgery, would delegate his full powers to the Vice President for the period of the operation, and the whole country could be assured that in the event of an attack we would not find our great engine of defense immobilized because of the lack of an engineer to pull the levers.

Of course, this constitutional amendment which I have introduced will be fully considered by the committee to which it is referred and in due time Justice Musmanno will, I hope, be invited to testify. The committee will subsequently report on the plan and the Senate will have the fullest opportunity to consider and discuss it. I thought it might be well, in view of the tremendous interest throughout the Republic on the subject, that I give this outline of the proposed amendment for the benefit of the Senate and all those studying this vital and perplexing constitutional problem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 155) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF ROME, N.Y., AIR MATERIEL AREA TRANSFER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the legislature of the State of New York has just passed a resolution calling on Congress to make a full investigation and review of the impact of the shifting of Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base to other facilities. The resolution clearly asks questions that have been in the minds of New Yorkers ever since this transfer of activities was announced. It calls on every Member of Congress from the State of New York to devote his efforts to achieving a full and fair study of the problems involved.

Mr. President, in pursuance of that objective, I submit, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a resolution to authorize a full study of the proposed transfer of this very active and expanding facility from Rome to other bases which are becoming obsolete and are facing a declining workload.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the New York State Assembly, concurred in by the New York State Senate, printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 76

Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate if it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.

Whereas ROAMA is now located at Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and

Whereas this is an integral part of our air defense; and

Whereas the worldwide situation is in such a state of turmoil that our defenses must be at full strength at all times; and

Whereas the withdrawal of ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y., would necessarily weaken our position; and

Whereas the moving of ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base would have a depressing economic effect on the entire area near Rome, N.Y.; and

Whereas sufficient reason or cause has not been made public of the feasibility of such plan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to make a full investigation to determine whether or not it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Concurred in, without amendment, by order of the senate, February 11, 1964.

ALBERT J. ABRAMS,
Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope it will be understood that what we are doing is, as lawyers say, "Putting the Government to its proof." We have deep convictions, after considerable investigation, that the path being trod is the wrong one. As the Senator has said, the proposal is to change the location of a vital, active, ground-based electronics communications installation. We do not say that the move should not be taken in an effort to keep alive something that ought not to be kept alive on the ground of national interest and security, but take this position because of our conviction that the decision is an incorrect one. Our duty is to put the Government to its proof, and to make our case as thoroughly as we possibly can.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator for this comment; he is entirely accurate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 298) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of whether it is in the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move the Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the Senate is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or members.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the Senate is not in session shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING, URBAN RENEWAL, AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 423)

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2468) to help provide adequate dwelling accommodations for more families who have low or moderate incomes, who are elderly, or who are subjected to the special problems of displacement from their homes by Government action; to promote orderly community development and growth; and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and com-

munity facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development, and William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and South Asia, Agency for International Development.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

SENATOR MCGOVERN A SPONSOR OF ARMS CONTROL RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, several days ago a number of Senators joined me in introducing Senate Resolution 295 to express the support of the Senate for the current Geneva disarmament negotiations and to lend encouragement to the achievement of a verified comprehensive nuclear test ban, among other proposals recommended by President Johnson.

Unfortunately, through an oversight on my part, the name of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] was not included as one of the original sponsors of this resolution.

I regret this error, for Senator MCGOVERN, as former Director of the food-for-peace program and since coming to the Senate, has done outstanding work on the problems of disarmament, on economic conversion as the author of some pioneering legislation I was proud to cosponsor, and in the field of international affairs generally. In fact, the Senator gave me a great deal of help in drafting this arms control resolution, making valuable suggestions and lending his strong support to this effort.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCGOVERN be added as a sponsor of Senate Resolution 295 and that his name appear on the resolution at its next printing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and resolution:

Authorities of December 18, 1963, January 14, 1964, and January 27, 1964:

S. 2396. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and

to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office: Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WALTERS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 10, 1964:

S. Res. 297. Resolution to amend rule VII to permit morning business statements or comments for 3 minutes: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HART, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

- S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.;
- S. 1206. An act for the relief of George Lou Rader;
- S. 1488. An act for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace; and
- S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1605) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for labeling of economic poisons with registration numbers, to eliminate registration under protest, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. KORNEGAY, Mr. HULL, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, Mr. YOUNGER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H.R. 6652. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code;
- H.R. 7751. An act to extend certain construction authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order to provide adequate veterans' hospital facilities in Los Angeles, Calif.;
- H.R. 8230. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts;
- H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy; and

H.R. 9609. An act to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund; and

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 6652. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 8230. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts; and

H.R. 9609. An act to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7751. An act to extend certain construction authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order to provide adequate veterans' hospital facilities in Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many years, I have urged that Congress adopt a code of ethics governing both its Members and employees—a code which might very well have averted the necessity of holding such an investigation as the one now being conducted by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

More than a year has passed since, along with my colleague [Mr. KEATING], I reintroduced in this Congress my proposal on this subject, Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, which would establish a Joint Committee on Ethics to develop and recommend a comprehensive code of ethics for Members and employees of Congress, and which sets out an interim code, pending the joint committee's recommendations. I believe the public interest demands action on this measure by the Rules Committee during its present deliberations.

In repeating my action of last March, I shall today abide by the disclosure provision of the interim code of ethics embodied in Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, as if it were law, and shall place in the RECORD a current statement of my financial holdings. I do this in order to practice what I preach. I did this last year;

and, it now being roughly 1 year thereafter, I do so again, today.

Section 6(b)(7) of the resolution would require that Members or officers or employees of the Congress "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of \$10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency" should make a matter of public record the nature of such interest by filing a statement with the Comptroller General.

Since the Comptroller General does not now have authority to receive and maintain such lists, I am now making a statement for the RECORD, to demonstrate my concern with the matter. As of this date, my holdings of the described nature are as follows:

As trustee of a family trust, I have an indirect interest in the following companies or their subsidiaries or affiliates, each in an amount exceeding \$10,000. These are normal investments in publicly owned corporations, and constitute no element of control, alone or in combination with others: American & Foreign Securities Corp.; Cities Service Corp.; Criterion Insurance Co.; Government Employees Corp.; Government Employees Financial Corp.; Government Employees Insurance Co.; Government Employees Life Insurance Co.; Sinclair Oil & Gas Co.; South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.; Southern Co.; Transamerica Corp. of Delaware, and Radio Corp. of America.

I submit the foregoing, Mr. President, for the information of my constituents or the information of anyone else who may be interested. I repeat that this is a fundamental aspect of a code of ethics which I have long urged upon Congress; and I intend to file such a statement annually, in order to demonstrate that I practice what I preach.

A similar provision is contained in the code of ethics of the State of New York.

If Congress should decide to adopt any other standard in connection with a code of ethics, I would think that greatly to the credit of Congress, and I would cheerfully comply, even though the one adopted might be somewhat different in form from the one with which I am complying at this time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let me suggest to the majority leader that I wish to make another statement for the record. If he will agree, I should like very much to have a quorum call at this time, in order to have an opportunity to obtain my papers. May I have a few minutes in that way?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAN THE SENATE RULES BE MADE TO WORK TO PASS THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I read with the greatest interest the statements of the majority and minority leaders yesterday on the issue of civil rights, a subject concerning which, I state with deference, I have had something to do throughout my public life. I would like now to comment upon it.

The aura cast around the subject by the statements of the majority leader and the minority leader was most creditable, and certainly apposite to the historic and serious character of the great debate in which we are about to engage.

First, I should like to pay my respects and tributes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the enlightening and patriotic spirit which dictated the very important pronouncement which each of them made.

I have been deeply involved in this issue, and undoubtedly will be throughout the debate, and would like to make a statement generally, also for the purpose of setting the stage for the civil rights debate.

The Senate is a very different institution from the House of Representatives. This is the only legislative body in the world in which a minority of Senators may, and often has, prevented, by means of a filibuster, the majority from coming to a vote, or has imposed its terms upon legislation by means of a filibuster or the threat of a filibuster.

The proposed civil rights legislation from the House of Representatives will need, not a majority vote, as called for by the Constitution, but a two-thirds vote, as compelled by the Senate self-made rule XXII. The question is now—and it is the question inherent in everything that was said yesterday—Can this archaic rule be made to work so that the civil rights bill can be passed as the people's representatives wish it to pass?

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 was passed by the Senate by a vote of 72 to 18, and the act of 1960 was passed by the Senate by a vote of 71 to 18. Nonetheless, somehow or other that legislation was not written by the 71 Senators who were in favor of the bill, but what was written in it was very heavily conditioned by what the minority—those who voted against it—thought it ought to contain.

Although cloture has never been invoked on a civil rights bill before and although rule XXII remains an unreasonable barrier to the consideration of such bills, I believe cloture can be invoked now because there is a broad consensus in favor of this bill unlike anything before experienced on a bill of this nature.

Never before has the whole Nation been so genuinely moved by the need for civil rights legislation as it has been moved by the tragic experiences which began with the Birmingham riots and the impressive, disciplined, and solemn march on Washington in August of last year.

For the first time, a broad range of Americans recognize not only the moral

imperative involved in giving enforceable meaning to the constitutional guarantees of equal opportunities, but also the tragic alternative of a resort to the streets, with all its potential for violence because the Government has not reasonably interposed its justice through law to answer the Negroes' legitimate grievances.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is no guarantee that, even if the Senate passes the House version of the bill, or strengthens it—as I hope it will—there will be no demonstrations. But it is one thing to have demonstrations for which there is an answer, under a law in which we have tried to do justice, and it is quite another thing to have demonstrations in instances in which there is no answer, and the only thing we can do is to admit that there is no law, there is injustice, and nothing has been done by law to try to end the injustices. On the one basis there is a controlled situation; and on the other basis, there may very well be an uncontrolled situation.

It is recognition of this which accounts for much of the difference between the present time and other times when we have considered civil rights. It accounted for the overwhelming vote for the bill in the House, with both Republicans and northern Democrats joining to pass the bill by a vote of 290 to 130 and to defeat emasculating amendments by similarly large margins.

The question for those Senators who are for the House civil rights bill is one of our determination. There will certainly be, and properly, a period of reasonable debate, and in order to bring this debate within a reasonable compass of time and to make it clear to all that a complete elucidation of their views is practicable, there should be no hesitancy about extending the hours of debate, even into continuous sessions. Let us remember that it took 9 days of such sessions to afford what the opponents regarded as a needed exposition of their views on the 1957 bill. We cannot shrink from this should it prove necessary, and I hope that the leadership will not shrink from it and that those favoring the legislation will be here, as they were in 1957—led by Senator Green, a man in his nineties—to answer the quorum calls.

Mr. President, we have had a very practical demonstration of what the Senate can do if it wants to assert its will, in the consideration of the communications satellite bill in 1962. If the 70-percent vote in favor of the civil rights bill in the House were matched in the Senate, we could invoke cloture on a civil rights bill for the first time since rule XXII was adopted.

I join the majority and minority leaders in their determination that we

must meet this issue and that history and duty will not permit us to "choose the course of evasion and denial," but the way to do this is to move in a practical and determined way. It is not to be precipitous but it also means that we proponents must be as determined as the opponents have proved themselves to be on so many occasions. In that way the issue will be joined and determined. I can assure the leadership that as far as I am concerned, there will be no lack of willingness to debate the details and the law in the most considered and respectful way, nor will there be any lack of determination to advocate and to join with my fellow Senators in order to see that the length of the sessions is commensurate with the issue, and that our determination on cloture, the enforcement of the rules, and every other aspect of the debate are fully equal to the determination which has been shown—and undoubtedly will be shown again—by the opponents of the proposed legislation.

RATES OF INTEREST CHARGED BY THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call attention to Senate bill S. 1926, introduced by myself, contemplating the adoption of a law which would require the Rural Electrification Administration to charge a rate of interest in making loans which would reflect the rate of interest that the Government must pay in borrowing the money to make the loans.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that at the American Farm Bureau Federation convention held in Chicago on December 12, 1963, among a number of resolutions proposed, there was offered a resolution dealing with rural electric cooperatives. The American Farm Bureau Federation has gone on record as asking for the approval of a policy that would require rural electric cooperatives to pay to the Government a rate of interest equal to what the Government must pay to borrow money to make the loan.

Mr. President, the Farm Bureau states as its 1964 policy on REA that:

1. We urge power companies to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand of farm people at reasonable cost. We urge efforts on the part of the local electric cooperatives and other private power companies to reach agreements that will be in the best long-time interest of all concerned.

2. Where further expansion or improvement of power production is contemplated, serious consideration should be given to the possibility of seeking funds for the program on an investment basis from members of the cooperatives. If revisions in legislation or regulations are needed in order to permit such procedures, we will support the necessary changes.

3. Rural electric cooperatives have performed a valuable service for rural America, but many factors affecting their operations have changed materially since Congress authorized their establishment. Any further loans made by the Rural Electric Administration to established rural electric or telephone cooperatives or other borrowers should be made at not less than the cost of money to the Federal Government.

4. Rural electric cooperatives should not participate in financing the rural areas de-

velopment program. We recommend that they confine their activities to the purposes for which they were organized.

The American Farm Bureau Federation was the sponsor of the initial law establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. The father of REA now comes before the Congress, in effect, and states that it should no longer be operated on the basis on which it was started. When the rural electric co-ops borrow money from the Government, they pay an interest rate of 2 percent, while the Federal Government is required to pay 4 percent to borrow the money to lend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may continue for 2 or 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 3 more minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In conclusion, I point out that the rural electric, which are competing with private power companies, pay 3 cents out of every dollar of their income in taxes. The private power companies pay 22 cents out of every dollar in taxes. Thus, it is apparent that private companies pay in taxes seven times more than do the rural electric co-ops. In addition, the Government is subsidizing these activities, as I have already pointed out, by lending money at 2 percent, while the Government must pay 4 percent on the money it borrows.

I may be a bit obtuse in my understanding of justice, but I cannot bring myself to understand that it is morally or economically right or that it is fair treatment of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. How does the Senator reconcile his opposition to having the REA borrow money at 2 percent when the Congress and the administration have approved the lending of money to foreign countries at three-quarters of 1 percent, with a 10-year moratorium—a policy which I object to, but was unable to have modified?

Mr. LAUSCHE. To the Senator from Alaska I gladly state that in the Foreign Relations Committee I proposed an amendment that would, at the very beginning, require a charge of a rate of interest to foreign borrowers equal to what had to be paid in the United States for borrowing money to make the loans.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the Senator. That was the reform which I sought to achieve.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I could get through only a provision that would allow a charge of 2 percent beginning after the 5th year after the making of the loan. Tragically, that effort was not successful. We are now making loans to foreign countries on a 40-year basis, with

no amortization of the loan for 10 years, and finally, at the beginning of the 10th year, with a charge of 2 percent interest. I do not subscribe to that policy.

Mr. GRUENING. While the Senator from Ohio may not agree with me on the REA, I am glad that we find ourselves in agreement on the foreign policy aspects of this question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BAYH in the chair.) Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask how we can justify having the taxpayers of the United States lend money at 2 percent to going business operations when the Government has to pay 4 percent to borrow the money?

Mr. GRUENING. The REA has fully justified its existence. It has done so much to promote the welfare, economic, and social standards of the American people by extending electricity to remote areas which never before had it or would not have received it from the private utilities—the so-called investor-owned utilities—that I think the policy has been fully justified.

AVAILABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR PROUTY ON S. 1732

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Commerce on S. 1732, a bill to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations affecting interstate commerce, appeared a pink slip, which I shall read:

U.S. Senate, Committee on Commerce.

The committee is unable to supply copies of part 2 of Senate Report 872, containing the individual views of Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY. The Government Printing Office has a limited supply of part 2 which may be purchased for 60 cents. Check or money order in that amount should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Additional copies of part 1 of Senate Report 872 also may be obtained from the Government Printing Office at 25 cents per copy.

To my knowledge this is the first time that individual views have not been included with a committee report; but I wish to make it known that I have a number of copies of part 2, which contains my individual views, and they will be made available to anyone who desires them, without charge.

In addition to my individual views, part 2 contains articles from the Texas Law Review, the Notre Dame Lawyer, the Cornell Law Quarterly, the Stanford Law Review, and the California Law Review, together with various appendices.

I believe my individual views, together with the information contained in the report, will be most helpful to anyone interested in the civil rights proposals.

Again, I say, these reports are in part II of the committee report, and will be available without charge if anyone desires them.

PROCEDURE FOR THE PROMPT SETTLEMENT, IN A DEMOCRATIC MANNER, OF THE POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5945, establishing a United States-Puerto Rico, Commission on the status of Puerto Rico, as amended, by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5945, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 5945) entitled "An Act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico", with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act."

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, to aforementioned bill, with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act, without reimbursement."

and in section 3, subsection (a) strike out "\$50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$75".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, to aforementioned bill, with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "not earlier than the later of the two following dates:

"(i) one year from the date of the meeting called for organizing the Commission as provided in section 2(d) of this Act;

"(ii) one year from the date on which the additional six members for which provision is made in section 2(c) of this Act are appointed, if such appointment occurs within six months after the effective date of this Act, and not later, in any event, than".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to the title, to aforementioned bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There is, of course, great interest in anything concerning Puerto Rico in the city of New York; and I should like to ask the Senator if he would explain what is being done and why.

Mr. JACKSON. This would call for the establishment of a Commission to study all factors which may have a bearing on the present and future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. As the Senator from New York well knows, there has been much

debate and discussion on this subject for many years.

Puerto Rico has commonwealth status. There are those who imply that this is something distinct and unique. There are those who say that the compact between the United States and the Puerto Rican people can be changed only by their consent. The committee has gone into the question in detail, and we do not agree with that policy. We realize that Puerto Rico, as a commonwealth within the jurisdiction of the United States, presents unique problems that have not been present in the past in connection with other territories. Therefore, the purpose of the Commission is to update the thinking as to what the long-range future relationships should be between the United States of America and Puerto Rico.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to inquire exactly what the House amendments propose to do which we are asked to adopt?

Mr. JACKSON. The House amendments are not of any substantive nature. The first amendment that the House added would substitute the language in section 2(c) for that adopted by the Senate to provide that assistance or information to be furnished to the Commission by the heads of departments in Puerto Rico shall be rendered "unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this act."

I believe that is clear, that it is to make information available to the Commission.

The second amendment is in section 3(c) of the bill to provide that—

The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this act, without reimbursement.

I believe that provision is clear. It is to facilitate the work of the Commission in making information available from Federal agencies.

The third amendment would amend section 3 by striking out "\$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$75."

This relates to the per diem rate.

The fourth one in section 4 proposes that the date for the submission of the Commission's report shall be not earlier than the latter of the two following dates:

(1) One year from the date of the meeting called for organizing the Commission as provided in section 2(d) of this Act;

(2) One year from the date on which the additional six members for which provision is made in section 2(c) of this Act are appointed, if such appointment occurs within six months after the effective date of this Act.

All of this means that they are not to report back prior to the elections.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. This Commission, I gather, is a recommendatory body; it is not a body which can bring about any change in the organic relationship; it is merely advisory.

Mr. JACKSON. It is completely advisory, and would be informational to the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, which have jurisdiction.

Mr. JAVITS. Do the provisions of the bill provide a procedure by which the recommendations of the Commission might then be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico, or does it leave it to the Legislature of Puerto Rico and the Congress of the United States to decide what shall ensue based upon the recommendations?

Mr. JACKSON. The Commission renders its report to the President, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, and to the Congress, and then the Congress acts.

Mr. JAVITS. The Congress of the United States?

Mr. JACKSON. Or the Congress may not act. It is up to the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. As to what it will do with respect to this matter?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. There is no delegation of legislative authority to the Commission to change in any manner the relationship that now exists between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Mr. JAVITS. Nor is the bill a self-operative scheme; but unless stopped by the Congress, it would—or through congressional action, perhaps action by the people or the legislature, or both, of Puerto Rico—come to some final consummation?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator knows that I am speaking most sympathetically, as I am sure the Senator understands. Puerto Rico has become an important demonstration of American policy in Latin America, especially in the Caribbean. Many of us who are neighbors of Puerto Ricans in the United States have a great interest in the problem. We have problems of migration from Puerto Rico to the United States, or back again. All of these questions are intimately involved in that framework. I was in the Chamber of the House of Representatives when it was shot up by a so-called Puerto Rican nationalist fringe group, of which the Senator is well aware; and that is the reason I ask this question: Is there nothing in the bill which will load the situation in favor of or against any of the three alternatives—commonwealth, statehood, or independence?

Mr. JACKSON. No. Let me point out that in the language on page 5 of the committee report there is this pertinent statement, under "Committee Comment":

First, if Puerto Rico enacts legislation to provide for its six members of the Commission, it is expected that the members selected will include representatives of the principal parties and points of view on the island.

Mr. JAVITS. That is all parties, across the board?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. It is the principal parties. There may be some minority parties that could not be included.

Mr. JAVITS. That includes the opposition to Governor Muñoz-Marín also?

Mr. JACKSON. It says "principal parties." It includes all the principal parties. That would include the Governor's opposition.

Mr. JAVITS. We wish to have that made clear.

Mr. JACKSON. I will repeat it. On page 5 of the committee report in this language:

First, if Puerto Rico enacts legislation to provide for its six members of the Commission, it is expected that the members selected will include representatives of the principal parties and points of view on the island.

That would be statehood, commonwealth status, and independence. Those are the main areas.

Mr. JAVITS. As well as the opposition to the Governor?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; the statehood advocates are clearly on the opposition side.

Mr. JAVITS. I would not wish for a moment to indicate to the Senator from Washington that I do not have the utmost regard for the Governor. We wish to understand what the framework is.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand. The Senator has been helpful in making clear the purpose of the Commission.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Washington for his information.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee report also contains this statement:

Second, the enactment of H.R. 5945 is not to be construed as committing Congress morally or legally to adopt all or any legislative recommendations the Commission may make.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe that is unequivocal.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Washington, as this is probably the final legislative act in this matter; and I am very grateful to him because he has helped to make clear the position of Congress in this delicate and important matter.

Mr. JACKSON. The senior Senator from New York has helped to clarify any lingering doubts that may have existed about the purpose of the Commission and what is expected of it.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE IMPACT OF AMBASSADOR BOWLES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 6 months ago Mr. Chester Bowles went back to India as the U.S. Ambassador there. I say went back for he served our Ambassador there from 1951 to 1953. This time he succeeded our able Amba-

sador, John Kenneth Galbraith, and further came in at a time of considerable disquiet in India. The Congress had turned down support of the Bokaro steel mill when India had counted on our help. The Indian Government was embarrassed to be forced by internal political pressure to pull out of an agreement with us to build a radio transmitter to counter Chinese propaganda. Our military aid to India was also subject to conflicting pressures in Indian politics. The most difficult situation of all however, was the lagging of the Indian plans for economic development.

Into all of these situations, Chester Bowles has moved with finesse. He has been particularly skillful in showing the Indian leaders how a use of private enterprise and foreign investment could help them solve many of their problems.

He has succeeded so well that Pravda, the Moscow daily newspaper, has been provoked to say that "Bowles stirs up trouble" in India. That is exactly what he has not done. He has been good for India and Indian-United States relations. If that is "trouble" for Pravda, they are privileged to make the most of it.

Mr. Bowles has again received a fine compliment, when the leading Communist newspaper attacks him for his effective work in India, which seeks to preserve democratic institutions and the democratic way of life.

The New York Times carried a story on the highly effective, quiet work of Bowles, and I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this time, for the benefit of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPACT OF BOWLES—ON SECOND TOUR IN INDIA, ENVOY HAS FACED TOUGH PROBLEMS

(By Thomas F. Brady)

NEW DELHI, January 20.—Chester Bowles, who returned to New Delhi as U.S. Ambassador 6 months ago, recently won from Pravda a resounding comment.

The Soviet Communist Party newspaper's comment on January 6 was that "Bowles stirs up trouble." It was reacting to a series of lectures at the University of Delhi in which the Ambassador analyzed, among other questions, the important role private enterprise can play in a planned economy.

Pravda commented acidly that the "Indian monopoly press," which is as free as any press in Asia, had given extensive coverage to Mr. Bowles' commentary.

Actually, there is one thing Mr. Bowles has not done, and that is to stir up trouble.

When he stepped off the plane here last July 17, he stepped into some nasty problems. The U.S. Congress was turning thumbs down on aid to an important and much-publicized development project, an enormous steel mill at Bokaro. His predecessor, John Kenneth Galbraith, had strongly championed Bokaro as had President Kennedy. Mr. Bowles had to face Indian disappointment.

The new Ambassador also had the duty of burying quietly an agreement from which the Indian Government was forced by left-wing political pressure to withdraw. The agreement called for the United States to provide India with a long-range, high-power radio transmitter to combat Chinese Communist propaganda.

In addition, an almost hysterical Indian feeling of military dependency on the West

that followed the Chinese invasion at the end of 1962 had begun to wear off. The Soviet had offered ground-to-air missiles in June in a move to restore some substance to Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's nonalignment policy.

Mr. Bowles had ahead of him politically vestigial joint air exercises, in which the Indian Air Force was to participate in November with units of the United States and British Air Forces. Indian military men were still happy about the project, but Indian politicians were beginning to wish the foreign planes could come to India completely unnoticed. The exercises passed without ill feeling.

Mr. Galbraith had been known here as a close adviser to President Kennedy. A rumor circulated that Mr. Bowles, for a time an Under Secretary of State, had been sent abroad because the Kennedy administration had no place for him at home.

Indeed, the fact that Mr. Bowles had already been Ambassador to India, from 1951 to 1953, and was known for his sympathetic understanding of the country, led some Indians to fear that his counsels might be discounted in Washington as those of a special pleader. Mr. Bowles knew all this and faced it with equanimity.

Then the Indians began to discover that Mr. Bowles was not without honor in Washington. The rear-guard battle he has fought to protect India against cuts in foreign aid has been deeply appreciated here.

An assessment of progress last fall midway through India's third 5-year plan for economic development showed desperate deficiencies in both industrial and agricultural expansion. Mr. Bowles began to explain that private enterprise and even foreign capital were not wholly pernicious—that with proper planning and governmental curbs they might provide vital leaven for the sagging economy.

At the same time he pointed out that the shrinking U.S. foreign aid program could be augmented to advantage by private investment from abroad if the Indians were capable of making their country safe for foreign capital without sacrificing their national interests.

The lesson carefully contrived by Mr. Bowles to avoid ideological offense to India's socialistic liberals started to take hold. The Communists have begun to find a disquieting trend toward "liberalism" in recent Indian economic thinking, and they blame Mr. Bowles.

Moderates at the governing Congress Party's national convention blocked a leftist demand for nationalization of the banks. To Pravda the "coincidence" was "interference in the internal affairs" of India.

The U.S. Ambassador is now faced with what may be the most crucial transition India has known since independence. The sudden illness of Prime Minister Nehru has underlined the question of political succession.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE IN CARACAS DESERVES RECOGNITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am most gratified to call the attention of my colleagues to an event of considerable significance which is taking place in Caracas, Venezuela, February 17-22. It is the First International Meeting of Development Financing Agencies sponsored by the Government of Venezuela and its Economic Development Corporation.

More than 150 of the world's leading figures in the field of development fi-

nancing will exchange information, experience, and ideas on all aspects of economic development. Out of their discussions will hopefully come regular and permanent procedures for international coordination and cooperation in developmental areas.

All countries of Latin America are expected to be represented except Cuba. Delegates will also attend from the United States, Europe, Africa, and Asia.

The Government of Venezuela is particularly deserving of recognition for initiating this effort which could have far-reaching beneficial effect not only in Latin America, but in all underdeveloped countries of the world. It is an effort additionally deserving of commendation as representative of the spirit of the Alliance for Progress.

It is especially noteworthy that this meeting was planned and announced by the Venezuelan Development Corporation several months before the December election. In so doing that public corporation expressed a confidence which the elections confirmed that the terrorist acts of the Communists would have no effect on the continuity of Venezuela's democratic form of government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with this subject, published in the New York Times of today, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VENEZUELA HOLDS PARLEY ON FUNDS—WORLD DEVELOPMENT MEETING STRESSES PRIVATE CAPITAL

(By M. J. Rossant)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, February 17.—Greater reliance on the role of private capital in speeding the economic growth of developing nations emerged as the main theme today at the opening session of the first international conference of financial institutions involved in development.

More than a hundred delegates from all over the world, representing commercial banks, investment houses, internal lending agencies, national development banks, and development corporations, are attending the week-long conference here sponsored by the Venezuelan Development Corporation.

They are exploring the problems associated with economic development in open meetings as well as in examinations of specific development projects through the use of the case method originated by Harvard University School of Business Administration.

NEED FOR STIMULUS CITED

The need to stimulate a big increase in private investment was emphasized by both Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. representative on the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress, and George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York.

Romulo Betancourt, the outgoing president of Venezuela, also addressed the conference. He agreed that foreign private investment was an essential ingredient in accelerating economic growth and invited foreign investors to step up their activities in Venezuela.

President Betancourt said that there was no conflict between government planning as practiced in a democracy and a favorable climate for private investment. Planning, he said, is not "the devil," but a practical way of getting the best allocation of resources.

The stress on private investment at the conference appears to reflect some dissatisfaction with the rate of progress achieved in the developing area under prevailing arrangements, which have been largely government to government. But there was no open criticism of the Alliance for Progress and other development programs.

BETTER MIX URGED

Instead most of the discussion concentrated on attaining a better mix of government and private investment. Mr. Moore and Mr. Moscoso agreed that increasing the amount of capital made available by private sources did not depend solely on a better attitude toward private investment on the part of governments in developing countries. They also said that business interests must cooperate in promoting development.

While there was a surprising degree of agreement on the need for increased investment by the private sector, there were some differences in detail.

Mr. Moscoso, who called for the creation of a "partnership relation" between government and private enterprise, placed particular emphasis on attracting foreign investment. He pointed out that "it is neither politically realistic nor socially just" to depend on domestic sources for development. He added that foreign funds were "generally indispensable" for growth.

In contrast, Mr. Moore gave top priority to policies that stimulate "domestic private capital in its own country of origin." He argued that measures designed to attract domestic capital that has fled to foreign markets will eventually serve to attract foreign funds.

CYPRUS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, now that virtual civil war has erupted between Greek and Turkish citizens of Cyprus, English officials are urgently asking us to intervene to keep the peace in their former colony. Very definitely this is not the responsibility of the United States. Britain, Greece, and Turkey have treaty obligations to guarantee the security of Cyprus. These nations should work together to end existing frictions between the Greek majority and Turkish minority on the island. I definitely oppose armed intervention by our Marines or paratroopers in Cyprus. It would be outrageous were one American soldier to lose his life in this former English colony.

England has not fulfilled her military commitments in Western Europe. We have more than fulfilled ours. Furthermore, since 1947 our Government has spent \$4 billion equipping the Turkish army and \$3,500 million equipping the armed forces of Greece. This is to protect that part of the free world from Soviet aggression. It was certainly not to arm them to fight each other. It would be tragic were two NATO allies to fight because of rivalries in Cyprus, killing thousands of their soldiers with American weapons. The British should seek a peaceful settlement. If they fail, then that nation should face its responsibility to end the civil war there. Our Nation has no mandate from the Almighty to police the entire world.

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the some 1 million Americans of Lithuanian

descent have two countries—the United States and their native European homeland. The contrast between the freedom which they enjoy here and the tyranny which oppresses Lithuania heightens their sense of loss. The Lithuanians who remain under Soviet rule have only their memories of 20 years of independence and their national culture and traditions to nourish their continuing struggle for freedom against great odds.

We all share this sense of loss on the occasion of the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, commemorated on February 16. We welcome this opportunity to reaffirm our strong and enduring friendship with the Lithuanian people. The cause of freedom, which is of such immediate importance for Lithuanians, is no less vital to all Americans. We hold that the Lithuanian people are entitled to a government of their own choice, and we look forward to the day when they can again enjoy national independence. It is our firm intention to further the cause of freedom in Lithuania and in all Baltic nations by working ceaselessly to establish a peaceful world order based on the rule of law. This aim will be achieved when and only when the Soviet colonial empire melts under the warming monsoon of freedom—under the winds which have brought liberty and national restoration to countless other peoples since World War II but which until now have been contemptuously ignored by the Soviet imperialists.

WE MUST SEEK TO ELIMINATE POVERTY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, American working men and women have won for themselves the highest standard of living in the world and a fair share of their own production. They rear their families on the right side of the railway tracks and they walk with dignity and love of country.

If I were a workingman, instead of a lawyer and presently a Senator of the United States, I would belong to the union of my craft, and I would sit in the front row.

Today American workers are confronted with a problem as complex and huge as its name is simple and small. That problem is automation. It is both a blessing and a threat, a blessing because it holds forth the promise of an ever greater production of goods, greater leisure and better living for all our people; a threat for the stark fact that it eliminates thousands of jobs.

The new technology has already created a host of problems for workers, indeed for whole communities. In our major industries, giant machines responding to pushbutton control by a few men can now produce goods which a short time ago required the labor of hundreds of men. It will test our ability as a nation to assure that the technological revolution we are experiencing in industry will not bring undue hardship to those whose jobs will undergo change or, worse, will become obsolete.

The fantastic new machines of this second great industrial revolution have

already permanently wiped out the jobs of thousands of American workers. The fact is that it threatens to eliminate additional hundreds of thousands of jobs while not creating enough new jobs to replace them.

It is clear that the great potential benefits of automation are being wasted. Instead of benefits, it has brought unemployment, idle plants and machines, and an alarming increase in the number of economically distressed areas.

That this is true can be seen by studying the character of unemployment figures during the postwar period when automation burst onto the American industrial scene. From the end of World War II until 1954, a rather steady rate of 3 percent of the labor force was unemployed. Following the 1954 recession the average unemployment rate was 4 percent, and since the recession of 1958, it has hovered around 5 percent.

Compounding the tragedy of a high, steady rate of unemployment is the fact that more than 2 million workers, most of whom want and need full-time work, are working only part time.

Assurances for the future offered by some business leaders are no substitute for thought and effort. They do not put bread on the table or money in the pockets of American working men and women. Officials of many companies have initiated programs to deal intelligently and fairly with workers whose livelihoods are lost due to automation. It is high time others followed their example.

As Americans, we must value human beings and human welfare above machines. We must assist workers and communities cut adrift by automation to adjust to the new technology and to share in its social and economic benefits.

Toward this end we in the Congress during the last 3 years have enacted into law the Manpower Retraining Act, the depressed areas bill, and the Area Redevelopment Act and have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to implement them. There is still much to be done. Government, labor, and business must work together to protect workers and their families against the hazards of industrial change.

Full employment and maximum use of our Nation's industrial capacity must be the major goals of domestic economic policy if we are to cope with the swift and awesome challenges of this decade. We must make full employment and full prosperity more than a slogan and a national goal. We must make it a reality. Involuntary unemployment is a great moral wrong.

We must urge business leaders to make every possible effort to plan jointly with representatives of their employees for the sweeping changes of the age of automation. Federal, State, and local governments must aid in this effort whenever possible. Responsible labor leaders have sought, unsuccessfully, for the most part, joint planning with industry to make certain that automation develops as the blessing it can and should be rather than the threat it has become.

Moreover, we who have been entrusted with leadership in this age of change and

challenge, must make certain that our economy grows at a rate which will generate new jobs for an ever-growing labor force. The ultimate test of our economic system is its ability to provide employment for our people. When there are millions out of work who want to work, our economy fails this crucial test.

Mr. President, the solutions to the complex problem of automation will be more difficult to find the longer we defer seeking them. I know that President Johnson and his administration consider the problem of automation one of the foremost facing the Nation. It is part of the overall problem of attacking and eliminating poverty in our country. Under the late, great President John F. Kennedy, I supported all legislation recommended by him to restore the health of the economy and to get our Nation moving forward. I shall support with equal vigor and determination the programs of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

During the last session of the Congress I voted, along with the majority of my colleagues, to eliminate over \$1,600 million from our foreign assistance program. To accomplish this took a great deal of research, study, and effort on the part of many Senators. Surely we in the Congress should work as hard—in fact harder—for the unemployed men and women in our country as we do to help the underprivileged in almost every other country in the world. I propose we legislate to eliminate poverty. It is a pitiful situation that more than 1 of 20 worthy and industrious men and women, including youngsters recently leaving high schools and colleges, are unable to obtain work.

Mr. President, we must concentrate upon the sad situation that, in this land of plenty, at least 5 percent of our labor force is unemployed. Involuntary unemployment is a great moral wrong. We must enact legislation and we must appropriate funds to help provide employment for men and women, particularly for the young men of our country, who for various reasons are denied the opportunity to work and to have the kind of future that we want our youngsters to have in this country.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON, A SKILLED TECHNICIAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Bill Henry, a knowledgeable columnist of the Los Angeles Times, has written an excellent article entitled "Johnson Skilled as Technician." The article, published in the January 12 issue of the Los Angeles Times, relates some of the multiple talents and abilities of our President. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 12, 1964]

JOHNSON SKILLED AS TECHNICIAN

(By Bill Henry)

WASHINGTON.—Lyndon Baines Johnson, if he never accomplishes anything else, has

made a lot of people sit up and take notice. There has been a tendency among his own party's intellectuals to dismiss the tall Texan as "just a mechanic" who is possessed of a certain amount of skill in the technical side of politics. A good many Republicans who had greater respect for a technician's know-how than the intellectuals in the Democratic Party, still classified Mr. Johnson as "strictly run of the mill." The Johnson state of the Union speech of a few weeks back has awakened a lot of skeptics to the realization that the new man in the White House has made fantastically good use of whatever political skills he possesses—and these appear to be considerable. In fact, looking back on the last half-a-dozen weeks, it is difficult to see how his performance could have been improved upon. Towards the end of last November, Mr. Johnson, despite his dashing about on Vice-Presidential chores, was almost a nonentity. He was completely overshadowed by the colorful personality of the then President. The spectacular circumstances of the assassination and the extraordinary nature of the obsequies tended to defy the late President and correspondingly shrink the image of his successor. Yet here in early January Mr. Johnson looms larger than life. His technical skill is smoothly assuming authority during the transition, the deft touch which he has shown in achieving acceptance by widely divergent groups, the bold manner in which he has seized the political initiative—these have combined to move him front-and-center where he is recognized now as a candidate who may be harder to beat next November than his predecessor would have been.

A MASTERFUL PERFORMANCE BY L.B.J.

All in all, this has been a remarkable performance. He has carefully clung to the popular image of his predecessor. He has espoused the Kennedy program, retained the Kennedy personnel. Having done so, he then boldly claimed to have improved on Mr. Kennedy's performance, presenting a somewhat smaller budget, predicting a smaller deficit. Finally he played his trump, declaring war on poverty and promising a bargain-counter Utopia—better life for all at smaller Government expense. His state of the Union message was a smashing political document. It had the effect of seizing the initiative and putting the skeptical opposition in the position of having to prove that what he proposes can't be done. That's hard to do in the few months that remain of the 1964 presidential campaign. It has been a rather triumphant exhibition of political skill and has inspired respect among his critics and perturbation among his opponents.

HOLDING THIS PACE WON'T BE EASY

The catch in all this—if there is one—lies in the fact that it was all accomplished during a political truce which found the opposition mute and disorganized while Mr. Johnson had the opportunity to demonstrate his skill unhampered. Certainly his stock is now at an alltime high. The danger, to him, is that it is so high that there is no way to go but down. Things can happen mighty fast in this modern world. It took almost no time at all for Mr. Kennedy's skyrocketing popularity which followed his inauguration to plummet earthward after the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Any student of government knows that awesome pitfalls await the Johnson legislative program on Capitol Hill. He rides tall in the saddle right now but it will be nothing less than miraculous if he can maintain this fantastic pace during the months that lie between this peak of performance and the moment in November when he must present his political promissory notes at the ballot box bank.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it appears that the Senate has completed morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 275, the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution—Senate Resolution 275—providing additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senate of the effectiveness of the rule of germaneness at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to discuss a matter not having to do with the resolution, and that the rule of germaneness be waived temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there was great rejoicing 46 years ago February 16 as the Lithuanians proclaimed independence after more than a century of Russian control. This freedom was enjoyed for 21 years, only to be crushed by Nazis and Communists in a ravaging pincer movement.

Once again this brave people was forced to wear the shackles of oppression. Hundreds of thousands were exiled to Siberia, where some still remain. Tens of thousands were executed. Under occupation Lithuania came to know collectivization, increased poverty, and religious persecution.

The institutions of freedom in Lithuania were destroyed, but the spirit of those institutions, conviction and hope could not be so easily extinguished. It is this flame that we of the free world dare not forget. To us it must serve as a reminder of the great courage with which the oppressed fight for survival. But that is not all. Our duty is to keep that flame of hope alive, to let the people of Lithuania know that we have not forgotten their fight for freedom, and to remind the free world that the Soviets, who call themselves champions of anticommunism, have in fact imposed the most vicious brand of colonial rule known to modern man. Their aim has been to break the spirit of the men, women, and children they conquered. It is a testimonial to the Lithuanians and the peoples of other captive nations that the Communists have never completely succeeded in this mission.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania on the 46th anniversary of their independence. Lithuania's existence as an independent republic was shortlived, covering only 21 years between 1918 and 1940. These years were made very difficult and troubled because of the constant Soviet propaganda and subversive activity designed

to smother the nation's freedom. Shortly after the outbreak of World War II, Soviet forces overran the country and destroyed its freedom. Over the years the 3 million people of this unhappy state have kept alive the hope of liberty and independence in spite of harsh restrictions, deportations, suppression of religion, and other repressive measures. Their friends and relatives here are helping to keep alive this hope that in the not too distant future, Lithuania will once again become free and independent. I share in that hope and the historic need to gain for Lithuania freedom from Communist tyranny.

TIME TO PUT SOME MUSCLE INTO ECONOMIC SQUEEZE ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most disturbing aspects of our failure to come to grips with the problem of communism in Cuba has been the manner in which our allies have refused to join us in the program of economic pressure. Although the problem of trade with Communist nations is admittedly a thorny one, to which there are no easy answers, our Government has failed to put sufficient pressure on our free world friends to insure that they keep up the economic squeeze on Mr. Castro.

Recent developments involving Britain and France have highlighted the deterioration of our Cuban policy and the rise of business-as-usual sentiment in Western Europe. Unless something is done, and done promptly, to reverse this trend, we might as well scrap our program to put the economic screws to Castro.

A perceptive editorial published in the Rochester Times-Union of February 10 outlines the manner in which our friends have sabotaged the Cuban quarantine. It should be must reading for all Members of this body and of the executive branch who are concerned about the threat posed by this Communist beachhead so close to our shores. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Times-Union, Feb. 10, 1964]

U.S. ALLIES BETRAY STRUGGLE AGAINST CASTRO
For years, Europe's Communist-line bleeding hearts have accused the United States of cozying up to dictators to enrich "capitalist imperialists."

Whatever the extent of this dollar diplomacy, and it isn't much, it is peanuts compared with the rescue of Fidel Castro's collapsing economy by greedy English and French industrialists.

First, Britain approved the sale of \$10½ million worth of new buses to Cuba, where public transportation had almost halted. Now France has authorized a \$10 million truck and tractor deal. Others are pending. And Belgium and Spain want their share of the Cuba trade.

As a final back-of-the-hand to Washington, the goods will be sent in East German freighters to evade the U.S. blacklist of ships which trade with the Cuban enemy.

These "allied" governments cringed in fear of nuclear war when Americans talked of

attacking Fidel and his Red band. So the U.S. tried economic isolation from the free world, throwing the full burden of sustaining Cuba on Russia and the Red bloc.

The policy never had much prospect of success, but at least it was causing increasing difficulty for Khrushchev and his Cuban buddy. As the economic squeeze tightened, there was always the chance that Cubans might save their country from ruin by getting rid of Castro themselves.

Now the quarantine, such as it was, is shattered. That leaves the U.S. with the bitter alternatives of (1) living indefinitely with this Communist cancer, (2) imposing a full blockade or (3) invading Cuba to throw the Red bums out. All involve grave risks to world peace.

It seems not to matter to our European "friends" that Castro is a bloody, brutal tyrant who hasn't even bothered to stage the usual Communist referendum, let alone hold a free election. They seem undisturbed over the efforts of Castro's agents to stir up trouble from Panama to Chile, from Caracas to Rio de Janeiro.

So the United States must act on its own—if it has the will—against Castro's threats, ranging from the annoyance of cutting off Guantanamo's water supply to the far graver matter of providing a sheltered Western Hemisphere base for Communist conquest.

But it is tragic that nations which say they share America's devotion to freedom have forced the United States to consider such a harsh and difficult change of course.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during the recent rioting and crisis activities in the Panama Canal Zone, one volunteer agency that continued to perform in a calm and praiseworthy manner was the National Jewish Welfare Board's Armed Forces Service Center in Balboa. From the moment the rioting commenced, the center remained open day and night to individuals and families who sought refuge there. The center's director, Rabbi Nathan Witkin, cooperated successfully with the police in finding ways and means for many American and Panamanian families to return safely to their homes.

Mr. President, this prompt and quiet reaction to the need of servicemen and others requiring assistance in unusual circumstances is typical of the fine work done at home and abroad by the National Jewish Welfare Board. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a detailed account of Rabbi Witkin's efforts during the Panama crisis.

There being no objection, the account was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JWB CANAL ZONE CENTER IS FOCUS OF WELFARE WORK IN PANAMA CRISIS

BALBOA, C.Z.—The National Jewish Welfare Board's JWB Armed Forces Service Center in Balboa served as a focal point for welfare activities during the recent crisis in the Canal Zone. According to word received by JWB from the center's director, Rabbi Nathan Witkin, who also serves as USO area director in the Canal Zone, at the moment that the rioting began, the center was host to a large group of American military personnel and their wives, civilians, Panamanian citizens and U.S. residents of the Republic of Panama who were attending a lecture.

As the lecture ended, word came to the center that the borders were closed, and no one could return to Panama because of violence on Fourth of July Avenue, the street which forms the border between the Canal Zone and the Republic. As a result, the center remained open all night and many families slept there. Rabbi Witkin was successful in working with police to find routes home for other Panamanian families before blockades were set up.

The center serves American military and civilian personnel in the area and has become a favored locale for communal activities involving citizens of the Republic as well as U.S. families. It was pictured on a recent postage stamp issued by the Republic saluting religious freedom. The center conducts a full-scale religious, cultural and recreational program, and as its sponsor JWB is the only mainland national Jewish organization operating in the Canal Zone.

During the first night of the upheaval, a number of GI families who live in Panama had to leave their homes because of threatened violence and came, with police assistance, to the center. Rabbi Witkin and his aids got in touch with the refugees' husbands and in the morning helped them to transfer to reception centers set up by the military authorities. Since that time, personnel associated with the center have helped at these reception centers, where more than 3,000 dependents were taken after leaving the Republic. Tasks have included gathering clothing, toys and contributions, working with children and giving special assistance to adults.

Rabbi Witkin has been visiting wounded servicemen at hospitals in the Canal Zone and has distributed comfort articles and other supplies provided by JWB.

An amateur radio station at the center handled thousands of messages to the States. No mail was moving, and it was virtually impossible to place commercial telephone calls, so the station provided an important link between personnel in the Canal Zone and their people at home.

Despite tensions which have existed between Panama and the United States over the Canal Zone issue, the Republic of Panama has from time to time recognized the contributions made by the center. In 1962 Rabbi Witkin received the Order of Balboa, the highest decoration given by Panama, in honor of his 25 years of service. The citation accompanying the award paid tribute to his "social welfare activities which benefit both the Panama and Canal Zone civilian communities" and hailed him as a "silent ambassador who has been able to solidify the civilian and religious groups within his mission in the Caribbean area."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him dealing with President Johnson's leadership in foreign affairs, together with an editorial entitled "Johnson on Foreign Affairs," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 3, 1964.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHURCH

All Americans are well aware of the ability, dedication and experience which Lyndon B. Johnson brought to the Presidency when he assumed that office under such tragic cir-

circumstances. It has been widely noted here and abroad that no other Vice President of the United States, succeeding a stricken President, has been nearly so well qualified, so well equipped to perform the duties of the most demanding office in the world.

President Johnson has clearly demonstrated in both foreign and domestic affairs that, 10 weeks after entering the White House, he is giving the Nation wise, aggressive, and imaginative leadership.

But today I wish to invite the attention of Senators particularly to President Johnson's leadership in foreign affairs. The Nation has been beset by crises all over the world in the last few weeks—in Cyprus, in Malaysia, in East Africa, in Panama, in Paris, and elsewhere. The problem of Vietnam continues to fester with increasing intensity. Already President Johnson has had bilateral meetings with the leaders of Germany, Britain, Italy, and Canada on a variety of subjects ranging from the future of world trade to the strengthening of the NATO Alliance. He has spent countless hours—at midnight and well into the early morning—with his own advisers: the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and others charged with responsibility for the Nation's security. By virtue of the vast experience he acquired as the majority leader of this body and as a Vice President with unprecedented duties in the field of foreign affairs, Lyndon Johnson has been able to deal with global problems with firmness, assurance, and wisdom. Most importantly, perhaps, he has dealt with the day-to-day crises on the international scene without ignoring the long-range objectives of the American people.

A prominent metropolitan newspaper which does not always see eye to eye with Democratic administrations carried an editorial Monday saying some things that should be emphasized to all Americans. The Philadelphia Inquirer told its readers that President Johnson had offered "good advice" at his weekend news conference, particularly with regard to the South Vietnam situation. The Inquirer is particularly impressive in the historical perspective—the maturity and balance, the perseverance and firmness and long-term view—which the editorial reemphasizes the President brings to his leadership on international issues.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Feb. 3, 1964]

JOHNSON ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President Johnson, in opening his weekend news conference with extensive remarks on U.S. problems abroad, set the general tone of his approach to foreign policy matters. Later, in answering newsmen's questions, he expounded on some specific situations, notably in southeast Asia.

We believe the President made several points that deserve emphasis. He spoke of the need for the American people to view each international crisis in proper perspective, not as an isolated incident but as part of the whole panorama of history. He stressed the importance of keeping the main focus of U.S. foreign policy on the central goals of peace and freedom. He urged the Nation to avoid dealing with every international difficulty on an emergency basis and to strive, instead, for practical solutions that not only meet the immediacies but will stand up over the long term.

The President seems to be following his own good advice in southeast Asia, which is just one of numerous farflung trouble spots he mentioned in the course of the news conference. As Mr. Johnson sees it, neutralization of southeast Asia, an idea being advanced by Charles de Gaulle, offers no real hope for peace and freedom if the neutral-

izing is to be done under terms favorable to the Communists.

History, past and present, supports President Johnson's thesis. China was lost to the Communists in the late 1940's after Chiang Kai-shek was forcibly persuaded by the United States to give Red leaders positions of responsibility in the military establishment and the civil administration. This, in effect, is the same technique the Communists now like to employ under the high-sounding label of neutralization. This already is apparent in Laos. It would become clear in South Vietnam, also, if the neutralization formula were applied there.

In the light of what is known about Communist objectives of conquest, whether engineered in Moscow or Peking, it would be incredibly naive to assume that the neutralization of southeast Asia under existing circumstances could achieve anything except pave the way for a complete Communist takeover.

President Johnson is on the right track when he opposes neutralization on terms favorable to Communists. It is a dangerous illusion—more akin to appeasement than to freedom, more likely to produce war rather than peace in the long run.

A matter to which the President needs to direct his attention is finding a satisfactory alternative to neutralization in southeast Asia, especially in South Vietnam. He favors—for the time being, at least—stepping up the military campaign against the Red guerrillas. We hope there is greater prospect for victory than has been evident thus far.

IT TAKES TWO TO MAKE A PARTNERSHIP WORK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the significance to our national interests of cooperation between Government and business cannot be overemphasized. There is no doubt that we need understanding and cooperation between business and Government to effectively insure employment opportunity and economic growth.

Last week one of the Nation's outstanding business leaders most effectively stated the need for a better relationship between business and Government and, what is even more important, urged business to take the initiative.

This address, entitled "It Takes Two To Make a Partnership Work," was delivered by Mr. Lamot du Pont Copeland, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. on February 10 before the New York Chamber of Commerce, New York City.

It is a noteworthy address, which I heartily recommend to my colleagues; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT TAKES TWO TO MAKE A PARTNERSHIP WORK (By Lamot du Pont Copeland)

I was highly honored last fall when my old friend, George Champlon, invited me to address one of your winter meetings. It isn't every day that someone from the provinces is offered a captive audience in the business and financial capital of the world. At the same time, I couldn't help wondering what I might say that could possibly be interesting or significant to such a sophisticated group.

It was a temptation to follow the tried-and-true formula which has become almost

a tribal custom on occasions like this. Speaking to each other, especially in a year exactly divisible by four which brings a national election, we point with pride to the merits and accomplishments of the free enterprise system, and we view with alarm the threats to that system which always seem to center in the political capital of Washington, D.C.

A little contemplation convinced me that I could add nothing of significance to a theme that has been expounded with force and eloquence so many times by so many others. In fact, I am sure I couldn't improve upon a stern warning delivered as far back as March 2, 1930, by a distinguished citizen of your own State. This speaker dwelt upon the strict limitations of the Constitution on the powers of the Federal Government, and then he said, and I quote:

"On such a foundation have we erected the whole enormous fabric of Federal Government which now costs us \$3.5 billion every year, and if we do not halt this steady process of building commissions and regulatory bodies and special legislation like huge inverted pyramids over every one of the simple constitutional provisions, we shall soon be spending many billions of dollars more."

You will doubtless conclude that this speaker had a great gift for prophecy, but this was only one of his talents, as the American people were soon to discover. He was then the Governor of New York, but 2 years later, Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to the first of four terms as President of the United States. Mr. Roosevelt was referring, of course, to the Republican administration then in power when he also said, in this 1930 speech:

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by 'masterminds,' in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years. Were it possible to find 'masterminds' so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country, but there are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history."

It is not my purpose today to pass judgment on whether all the teachings of history have been reversed in the last several decades. I am quite sure you have your own opinions, and I have mine. It does seem to me that this speech to which I have referred—and what has happened since in our country under Democratic as well as Republican administrations—confirm the wisdom of a few words uttered back in the second century by a Roman philosopher, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, when he said: "Observe always that everything is the result of a change, and get used to thinking that there is nothing nature loves so well as to change existing forms and to make new ones."

In the chemical industry, we have been profitably aware of this trait for many years. We rely heavily upon nature's fondness for letting us change existing physical forms and make new ones for the continued health and growth of our business. Perhaps it should come as no surprise to us that nature has been equally active in other areas, including our economy and the role which government now plays in it.

It has become painfully obvious, to me at least, that we are no longer permitted to operate American business in the simon-pure atmosphere of the free enterprise system of Adam Smith. To put it bluntly, there may be reason to suspect that what we once

called creeping socialism in our economy has now learned to walk. At the very least, to employ a more polite phrase, we have a "mixed" economy, and scholars have some difficulty in determining just what it should be called.

An article in a recent issue of the highly literate magazine, *Saturday Review*, gave a number of definitions, but the author, Prof. R. Joseph Mosen, Jr., of the University of Washington, finally concluded:

"American capitalism is, in one way at least, a little like electricity: Nobody knows exactly what it is, but it works—and works well."

One thing is perfectly apparent. Whether we like it or not, the Federal Government is a partner in every business in the country. For most of us here today, it has been a majority partner, for let me point out that the Government has been taking 52 percent of the earnings of the Du Pont Co. before anything has been available for our 233,000 stockholders who have invested their savings in our enterprise, and who are, at least, its nominal owners.

There are some businesses which have silent partners, but I submit to you that the Government distinctly is not. Our partner looks over our shoulders every minute of the day with virtually as many eyes and ears as there are Federal agencies. We are required to consider the wishes of our partner in virtually every business decision made, for, if he isn't interested as the Internal Revenue Service, he is as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and the Interior, and, of course, the Department of Justice, to name but a few.

Our partner would have considerable difficulty with his hundred-billion-dollar annual budgets if we didn't serve as his tax collector—not only from the business, but from our employees and, in many instances, our customers. We are compelled to file voluminous reports on almost everything under the sun for our partner's vast intelligence system—and the more we tell him, the more he wants to know. We share with our employees the cost of their social security benefits, but our partner makes the disbursements to grateful recipients. We have learned, through costly experience, that the laws our partner enforces are complex and frequently ambiguous, so we maintain extensive and expensive legal staffs to help us understand how we can compete under the Sherman Act—and, at the same time, avoid any injury to competitors under the Robinson-Patman Act.

This not-so-silent partner of ours is significant to business in a number of other ways, too. The Federal Government is the biggest spender, the biggest employer, the biggest property owner, the biggest tenant, the biggest insurer, the biggest lender, the biggest borrower, and the biggest customer in the free world.

Perhaps I could best sum up the stature which Government has reached in our economy with a story. A Delaware farmer heard his chickens squawking in the middle of the night. Grabbing his shotgun and flashlight, he rushed out to investigate. Braced immobile against the wall of the chickenhouse was the dim figure of an intruder.

"What are you doing here?" the farmer demanded. With far greater dignity than the occasion justified, the presumed chicken thief solemnly replied, "Everybody has to be somewhere—all the time."

In contrast to the intruder, the Federal Government is not somewhere, but everywhere—all the time.

You may believe, as I do, that, if we had less government, we would have more enterprise. We are confronted, however, with a

condition and not a theory. If we are to retain any hope of solving the grave problems of this age, we must do everything possible under whatever system we have to maintain a strong, healthy, and expanding economy.

What I should like to suggest, in the few minutes of time remaining, is a conscious, determined effort on both sides to improve the relationship between business and Government.

In recent years, much has been said about the necessity for businessmen to get into politics. While I have also heard it said that businessmen, with notable exceptions, make poor politicians, we should certainly add our voices to the chorus which makes the political decisions in our society. However, it is just as important, in my opinion, for businessmen to take a far more active part in the day-by-day processes of government.

It is tempting to ask for a show of hands on how many of you have a personal acquaintance with your representatives in the State and National Legislatures, but this might be embarrassing. Or how long it has been since you sat down with one of them to discuss a problem or proposed legislation affecting your business? Or whether you have ever sought permission to express your views before a legislative committee? Or whether you have ever asked to be heard before an administrative agency?

Too often, I am afraid, we have delegated these responsibilities to our trade associations. The representatives of these organizations render a valuable service, but this is not enough. What interests government decisionmakers, and, I believe, impresses them, is firsthand information from you about your business, and specifically how it would be affected by their decisions.

A better relationship with government also would be furthered if businessmen paid more heed to the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We know from long experience that the way to prevent industrial accidents is to provide safe working conditions and safety training which is insistent as well as persistent. Why, then, do we wait until legislation is drafted before we ring the firebells and try to do something about it?

If we don't know who the policymakers are at the State or National level, we can find out. We should then be diligent to provide them with information, discuss with them our mutual problems, and give them our best judgment based on knowledge and experience as to how these problems can best be handled in the national interest.

Let me cite an example. One of our plant managers recognized, a few years ago, the emergence of a strong demand for State legislation on air and water pollution affecting a highly concentrated chemical manufacturing area. Instead of waiting for bills to be introduced, he and his associates from other plants in the area called in engineers and technicians and drafted an effective bill. It met the problem, but the legislation also was such, as he put it, that industry was able to "live with it." The bill was enacted into law with industry support.

If time permitted, I could cite many other instances from our own experience where determined efforts to bring about a better understanding in Government have been successful. The most notable was carried out by my predecessor, Crawford H. Greenewalt, when the Du Pont Co. sought tax legislation which would permit an orderly divestiture of its General Motors stock. It took hard work over many months in which he paced corridors, knocked on doors, and called personally to explain the facts to virtually every member of the House and Senate committees involved, to key people in interested Government agencies, and to

leaders of both parties in the Congress. Then, and not until then, the bill was overwhelmingly approved by the House and Senate and was signed into law by the late President Kennedy.

I don't think we shall ever forget the lesson we learned at that time. In relationships with Government, it is not enough for businessmen to be convinced that what they advocate is fair and right. We must also win the understanding of the appropriate people in Government that it is fair and right. They will listen if we approach them with honesty and integrity, and I think you will find that, regardless of political affiliation or ideology, it is the exception who has a completely closed mind. The exceptions we must bear with, even as we win under the unfairness of their attacks, content in the knowledge that they usually constitute the minority when the chips are down.

What I am really trying to say, I suppose, is that it would be in the national interest, as well as our own interest, to put an end to what, at times, has seemed like a cold war between Government and business.

We may not like our involuntary partnership, but, as President Johnson said recently, it is possible to disagree without being disagreeable. As businessmen, we need the understanding and cooperation of Government in our efforts to throw the economic machine into higher gear. At the risk of seeming immodest, I believe Government could make better use of the brains, the ideas, and the experience of American business management.

The better relationship which I have proposed will not be achieved by standing off at arm's length or at sword's point. Someone will have to take the initiative. There may be times when we will be rebuffed, and I am sure there will be many times when we are told that our interest is in conflict with the national interest. We should not be discouraged, for I am convinced there will be many other times when these efforts will be richly rewarded.

THE IOU'S—NO. 6: METROPOLITAN LIFE AND TVA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one life insurance company has invested more than twice as much in the electric power industry than the Federal Government has invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I believe it is useful to make such a comparison so consumers have a better understanding of private and public investment in the power industry.

The investor-owned utilities attack the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration in their movie, "The Power Within," which I discussed on the Senate floor on January 8, 1964.

Federal investment in TVA, "the biggest power system in the entire country"—to quote from the script of "The Power Within"—is dwarfed by the investment in electric utilities by the world's largest life insurance company, Metropolitan Life.

At the end of the fiscal year 1962 TVA had a net worth of \$1.8 billion, well over half a billion more than the \$1.2 billion Treasury investment in the system, according to a report issued by TVA last year.

At the close of 1962, Metropolitan Life owned \$2.4 billion in utility bonds and \$101 million of preferred and common

stock, according to a report entitled "The Electric Utilities," which was published last year by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS TRIGGERS TAX REFORM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the basic tenets of the Alliance for Progress program is the need for tax reform in many of the Latin American Republics as a condition for American economic assistance. In view of the tremendous partnership task of raising masses of people from poverty and despair to a better life, it is most encouraging to note that nearly all of the Latin countries are in the process of making these needed reforms. An article in the *Journal of Commerce* for February 3, 1964, points up the reform movement underway and what our own Internal Revenue Service is doing to give technical assistance in tax collection and tax administration. Mr. President, because of the interest in the Alliance for Progress and our need to shore up our hemispheric plans for understanding and development, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

U.S. HELP REQUESTED: LATIN AMERICAN NATIONS TRUDGE DOGGEDLY TOWARD TAX REFORM

(By Stanley Wilson)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—While political disturbances boil in the background like erupting sun spots, Latin America plods on hatingly toward the tax reform which can—someday—promote its stability—economic as well as political.

Progress is hard to measure among the 19 Alliance for Progress countries, whose American economic assistance is in theory, tied to reform action. But all save Haiti and Paraguay have made some strides since the Alliance began in 1961.

SOME PROGRESS SEEN

Those involved in the effort from the Washington end feel there has been improvement, by and large, even though it may not be conspicuous. "The training of 200 more auditors doesn't get into the news," was the way one observer phrased it.

Even the optimists, however, do not set a target for visible profit from tax reform, replenished Latin treasuries, diminished unrest, economic progress and the like—before 1965 or 1966.

This timetable could prove to be too slow if the alliance slips or founders, as recent events suggest it might.

With regard to structural tax law changes alone, neither 1963 nor 1964 are apt to be remembered as vintage years for improvements. Colombia had the only major structural advance in 1963," observes one official here. "The other countries were just conducting tidying up operations."

FIRST WAVE DIGESTED

Though circumstances differ very much from one Latin nation to the next, the widespread slowdown in significant structural reform stems in part from the fact that some Alliance countries are just now digesting the first wave of tax law changes effected during 1961-62.

More important, however, a change of emphasis has occurred.

There is a rapidly burgeoning sophistication about the collection of taxes among Latin tax officials in countries notorious for tax evasion.

Latin finance ministers are increasingly conscious of the big shortfall in collection of taxes presently due, which in some cases would be enough to balance the national budget even without changing the law.

Taking advantage of this official interest, now very keen in some countries, the Alliance has called upon the U.S. Internal Revenue Service for technical assistance in tax collection and other phases of tax administration.

Since July 1962, under a program headed by Harold Moss of the Internal Revenue Service, more than 50 IRS advisers have gone down to Latin America, most of them on 2-year tours of duty. Another 25 will be on their way by next June.

IRS teams are already in Colombia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Panama, Guatemala, and Nicaragua. Costa Rica and probably others will receive similar reinforcements this year.

Wherever they go, U.S. advisers not only assist in mapping out working tax programs but set up training programs to nurture sorely needed future generations of Latin American tax administrators and collectors.

DISORDERS COMPLEX

However, the inherited disorders in Latin American fiscal affairs are too complex to be cured simply by making tax administration more efficient.

Latin taxpayers for example, say they don't pay all their taxes because they distrust the competence and honesty of their governments.

To counter this widely held and sometimes justified opinion, the Alliance is sending advisers to counsel on spending objectives and also to introduce modern techniques of "performance budgeting"—i.e. expenditure control in terms of need and utilization rather than simple bookkeeping—into the administration of Latin public finance.

But if tax collection efforts were to achieve complete success under present laws, the result might be a social explosion, since many Latin tax structures are still today highly inequitable.

Latin Americans themselves add a caveat in the opposite direction. To go too quickly in the direction of equity, they point out, might be to siphon off too much private development capital, particularly in the poorer countries.

REFINEMENTS WASTE

A few Americans say that the additions of further refinements to the income tax laws of the area would be a waste. Latin tax systems, they feel, are already too complicated for populations with a high percentage of illiterates.

In the early stages of the Alliance, U.S. officials thought progress toward tax equity could be measured by the extent to which Latins reduced their high dependence on indirect taxes and put more weight on the use of the income tax mechanism.

Now it is being argued in some quarters here that a good sales tax is the best prop in the short run and a tax on land appears to be the most desirable single reform in the period immediately ahead. "With tax collections at 50 percent of potential yield, it makes no sense to soak more money out of those who do pay income tax."

Certain major tax blemishes are apparent in a large number of the Alliance countries, and will have to be corrected sooner or later (in some cases, partial corrections have already been made).

CLUTTER OF TAX LAWS

First is the overall clutter of Latin tax laws, which have accreted enough confusion

and contradiction over the years to allow almost every taxpayer to find some avenue of legal avoidance. One of Colombia's brightest achievements has been the reworking of its disjointed heap of old tax laws into a unified code.

Second is the compartmentalization of tax revenues owing to the Latin habit of voting ad hoc special taxes to support autonomous government agencies—i.e., Brazil has a tax on electricity to fund a public body comparable to the U.S. Rural Electrification Administration.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in primitive societies when hunger and want were the rule, the position of the senior citizen was frequently a tenuous one. If the aged could not function in the hunt or produce in the village they often became unwelcome.

In some Eskimo societies the elderly were abandoned when they could no longer stalk the seal, tend the dogs or sew hides. They were left in the cold to freeze as the younger and more vigorous members of the tribe moved on in search of food.

In the United States today where affluence has reached unbelievable peaks this question can be asked: Are we abandoning our aged by failing to provide a comprehensive program of hospital and nursing home care during just that period when society should be most solicitous?

A recent editorial from the Newark Star Ledger answers this query with a resounding "Yes." I agree with the cogent reasoning of the editorial and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Feb. 12, 1964]

A HEALTHY APPROACH

Medicare suffered a severe relapse early in its legislative life.

It went into a steady decline and it has been convalescing for a number of months. The recovery has been slow until this week, when it took a sudden turn for the better. It was a dramatic recovery that some people had been forecasting for the past couple of weeks.

Adrenalin was pumped into the ailing bill by President Johnson with his appeal to Congress for a program of hospital and nursing home care for the aged. This care would be financed through social security.

"There is no need and no room for second-class health services," the President noted in a special health message to Congress.

The President's interest in the revival of controversial medical care for the aged was not unexpected. He made it one of his major points in his state of the Union address that he would push for enactment of this program, originally proposed by the Kennedy administration.

The medical care program being supported by Mr. Johnson is incorporated in the King-Anderson bill that is pending in Congress. Hearings on the legislation were completed 2 weeks ago by the House Ways and Means Committee but no action has been taken.

The financing of the medical care program was detailed by the President in his message. One-quarter of 1 percent would be added to social security contributions

paid by both employer and employee. Annual earnings subject to social security taxes would be increased from \$4,800 to \$5,200.

All persons over 65 would be eligible for medical care in hospitals and nursing homes. Those not covered by social security would be cared for with appropriations from general funds, giving them similar protection.

Since doctor bills would still have to be borne by the patient, it would remove one of the serious objections by medical groups that the free choice of physician would not be possible under federally financed proposals.

One of the ironies of the dramatic advances made by modern medicine is that it has significantly increased the life span of Americans. They are living longer but their illnesses are longer and prohibitively costly. The declining years of our elderly can and has become a medical nightmare because prolonged sickness can wipe out lifesavings.

For these people, as the President observed, "old age can become a dark corridor of fear."

The care of the aged is a social obligation, a historical obligation that goes back for centuries. It is a debt that society must assume fully and forthrightly. We are doing it now through our welfare assistance programs.

One-third of the aged forced to seek old-age assistance are compelled to do so because of ill health. One-third of the Federal welfare funds are going to older people for medical care.

The big factor missing in the present program is the abysmal lack of dignity for elderly people who must seek public assistance because prolonged illness has wiped out their savings.

Under medicare, they would be entitled to this protection. It would not be charity, since they would have paid for it during their lifetime out of their earnings. It is a healthy approach in dealing with the growing problem of the elderly sick.

FOREIGN AID MONEY SPENT IN UNITED STATES REACHES ALL-TIME HIGH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an article published in the *Journal of Commerce* for February 6, 1964, clearly points out the facts concerning the amount of dollars spent in the United States for goods and services financed by our AID program. The article notes that "figures just released show that 84 percent of all commodities financed by our AID program during the first quarter of fiscal 1964—July through September 1963—were purchased from American suppliers." This percent marked an alltime high rate, six points above the 78-percent average for fiscal year 1963—ended June 30.

Another significant development is the fact that "while purchases in the United States rose, a continued drop was noted for procurement in the 19 developed countries—mainly Western Europe and Japan. Their share declined to 3 percent during the first quarter of fiscal 1964. The remaining 13 percent went to developing nations."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SNARES LION'S SHARE OF AID-FINANCED TRADE

WASHINGTON, February 5.—The latest report from the Agency for International Development (AID) refutes more strongly than ever the often-heard complaint that funds provided developing nations bring little or no returns to U.S. business. The figures just released show that 84 percent of all commodities financed by our AID program during the first quarter of fiscal 1964 (July through September 1963) were purchased from American suppliers. This, the agency announced, marks an alltime high rate.

Out of a total of \$310.2 million in AID expenditures during the July-September period, \$259.4 million came back in the form of orders to U.S. firms. This 84 percent record return was 6 points above the 78-percent average for fiscal 1963 (ended June 30).

Iron and steel mill products headed the commodity list for a total of \$52 million in sales. Eighty-two percent of this or \$42 million went to U.S. suppliers.

OTHER COMMODITIES

Other commodities involving large expenditures during the quarter, with totals and the percentage purchased in the United States follows:

Chemicals and related products, \$31 million, 93 percent; electrical apparatus, \$30 million, 87 percent; industrial machinery, \$26 million, 89 percent; petroleum and products, \$23 million, 46 percent; motor vehicles, engines, and parts, \$23 million, 97 percent; railroad transportation equipment, \$13 million, 99 percent; construction, mining, and conveying equipment, \$13 million, 98 percent; and nonferrous metals and products, \$11 million, 89 percent.

The major share of the commodities was sold to countries in the Near East and south Asia (\$181 million), and the U.S. share of this business was 93 percent. Latin America got \$28 million, with 99 percent of it spent in this country. AID expenditures in Africa totaled \$10 million (with 86 percent returning to American firms). In contrast, the agency financed only \$4 million worth of commodities for Europe with 85 percent of them supplied by U.S. firms.

While purchases in the United States rose, a continued drop was noted for procurement in the 19 developed countries (mainly Western Europe and Japan). Their share declined to 3 percent during the first quarter of fiscal 1964. The remaining 13 percent went to developing nations.

A TRIBUTE TO TED SORENSON

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, many words have been spoken and written in tribute to Theodore Sorensen, the Special Counsel to President Kennedy.

Mr. Sorensen will soon be leaving his post to take up the writing of a memorable book covering his years with the late President. No one, it seems to me, has offered a more fitting commentary on the role of Ted Sorensen than Mr. Max Freedman, the distinguished columnist.

Mr. Freedman's commentary entitled "A Tribute to a Kennedy Aid," appeared in last night's *Evening Star*, Monday, February 17, 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that this deserved tribute to a man marked for greatness be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO A KENNEDY AID—THEODORE SORENSON'S ROLE SEEN MORE THAN JUST THAT OF SPEECHWRITER

(By Max Freedman)

On Wednesday, a few days before his departure from Washington, Theodore C. Sorensen, the special counsel for President Kennedy, will be honored at a public ceremony sponsored by the present and former members of the Cabinet and by his closest associates in the Government. It is difficult to recall any other public servant who has received such a tribute, and impossible to think of anyone with an equal claim to public recognition.

It is a strange misconception of Mr. Sorensen's role to think of him primarily or essentially as Mr. Kennedy's most trusted speechwriter. He is the last man to minimize the power of eloquence as the champion of great causes. But he knows that the art of politics consists in turning ideas into achievements; and he towered into greatness as an architect of policy and a master of strategy. He was so valuable to Mr. Kennedy in the drafting of state papers precisely because he was so familiar with the ideals and hopes of the leader whom he delighted to serve.

This surely is the central point, the one which means the most to Mr. Sorensen. He saw in Mr. Kennedy the leader who embodied and fulfilled his own highest principles of government. It was never necessary for Mr. Sorensen to attribute to Mr. Kennedy any specious ideals of his own. His task was rather to draw out and express the ideals which glowed with quiet passion in Mr. Kennedy's mind and heart.

One tiny story will illustrate the almost unique gift which Mr. Sorensen and Mr. Kennedy both had in being able to laugh at themselves without ever laughing at their principles. Within a few days of its delivery, President Kennedy's inaugural address, with its soaring eloquence and majestic idealism, was universally recognized as a noble affirmation of the faith which has often glorified America in times of challenge. The overflowing praise rather embarrassed the President, and one day Mr. Sorensen drew gusts of laughter from Mr. Kennedy by bringing him a hilarious parody—never published to this day—of the inaugural address.

Now Mr. Sorensen would have put his hand in the fire to protect the principles of that speech, and Mr. Kennedy served those ideals with gay courage to the moment of his death. For both of them what mattered above everything else was the victory of principles, not the glory of words; and they shrank with wise reserve from turning the tributes to the speech into the exaltation of the speaker.

We are fortunate beyond the usual measure of men in knowing that before many months have passed we will be able to look at President Kennedy and the record of his administration through the eyes of Mr. Sorensen and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Their two books will not be competitive, for they will approach their subject from different points of view, and will throw accumulated light on a gallant and unforgettable figure.

Mr. Schlesinger came to the White House with an established reputation as an historian, a biographer, and an interpreter and defender of democratic values. His years in the White House add another notable chapter to his record of public service. But with Mr. Sorensen it is rather different. He will not only be rearing a monument to Mr. Kennedy; he will also be going on a pilgrimage into his own past. He has it within his power to

write a book about President Kennedy that will be at once unique, invulnerable, and immortal, if it is no exaggeration to use Augustine Birrell's words in tribute to Gibbon.

Then, his task completed, Mr. Sorensen will be on his own. That may well be the beginning of a new career of great significance for the American people. Mr. Sorensen will not seek elected office for himself; but in the world of ideas and in the clash of debate his influence will often count decisively, and it will be an influence with which scrambling politicians will have to reckon. Countless people, especially young people with an adventurous faith in the destiny of America, look to Mr. Sorensen as a spokesman for their hopes. Not even the cruel changes of a democracy can dim our memory of his vallant services, not extinguish our conviction that in service to President Johnson and other Presidents he will many times place the whole country again under obligation to him.

THE REPERTORY THEATER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a new revival of an old American institution, the repertory theater, is now sweeping across the country at an accelerated pace. This is one of the important evidences of the cultural ferment that is developing increasingly from coast to coast. Sponsored by communities, by colleges and universities, by public-spirited citizens and by courageous experimental groups, this new phase of the American theater is reflecting a growing public interest. Philanthropic foundations have contributed in substantial measure toward making this cultural growth possible but there are very definite limitations to this kind of assistance. The bill which the Senate passed, S. 2379, contains the proposal for a U.S. National Arts Foundation, which I have sponsored since coming to the Senate and for many years before that. It is now pending in the other body. It can become a vital force in helping the development of this and other movements in the performing and visual arts. I deeply believe that a program of education will stimulate public opinion to the need for Federal action in this field. We are in this respect far behind all the other leading developed nations in the world and have a model for action by us consistent with our traditions in the British and Canadian Arts Councils.

An important report on the rise of the new repertory theater has just been published. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report entitled "The Rise of Rep," which appeared with copious illustrations in Time magazine, February 14.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STAGE THE RISE OF REP

Repertory theater, never much of an institution in the United States, has grown in recent years in every region of the country, and the movement is overdue. Rep companies are the tap source and 5-foot shelf of theater in other nations; they give actors unmatched experience, they try

new forms, and they keep the so-called classics dusted.

A Rembrandt can be seen and Melville can be read; but Marlowe or Molière are pale shadows in paperback. They must be performed on the stage to come alive, and the commercial theaters are not going to underwrite such performances. Only professional repertory companies, through constant revivals, can preserve the history of the drama in a meaningful form. Similarly, when the art of theater is to be advanced, only a company that is not hooped to commerce can try something new and almost certainly unpopular without fear of financial ruin. By and large, the American theater ignored the obvious need of rep groups until it could ignore them no longer.

OUT OF THE QUAGMIRE

The rise of repertory owes much to Broadway, in a negative sort of way. Broadway has got itself into such an economic quagmire that only its most negotiable shows last very long. Hence acting jobs are few and dispiriting, and actors with big names as well as small ones are more than willing to sign on with rep companies, in most cases abandoning New York. They want to act—in three or four different plays a week sometimes—and they want to know what they are going to be doing a month from now. They don't mind the lower pay; at least it is steady. One good reason that it is steady—beyond the well-demonstrated popularity of rep groups with local audiences—is that the Ford Foundation believes in repertory theater perhaps even more than actors do. In the last 4 years, Ford has given almost \$7 million to various repertory groups.

Rep companies across the country are shown in the adjoining color portfolio. An index of how advanced the movement has now become is the fact that New York is catching up with it. Biggest event of the 1963-64 theatrical season was the debut last month of the Repertory Theater of Lincoln Center.

On paper, the group is an assembled dream. The permanent acting company consists of 26 actors working under 2½-year contracts, and includes such names as Jason Robards, Jr., David Wayne, Hal Holbrook, Ralph Meeker, Mildred Dunnock, Zohra Lampert, and Salome Jens. About half the actors are young newcomers who are being trained as they go, both in productions and in dally classes that have been going on for more than a year. The group's guiding lights are Robert Whitehead, who was one of Broadway's most successful producers ("Member of the Wedding"), and Director Ella Kazan ("A Streetcar Named Desire"). Its "executive consultant" is critic-director Harold Clurman ("Waiting for Lefty"). Its stage designer is Jo Mielziner, like the others one of the top men in his profession in the United States.

Established playwrights are giving their plays to Lincoln Center as well. Getting things off to a quite literally sensational start, the company's first production is Arthur Miller's controversial "After the Fall" and its third will be S. N. Behrman's "But For Whom Charlie." Behrman is 70. "I'm left over from another era," he says, "but I'm glad I didn't die." Behrman's "Charlie" is now in rehearsal, as is Eugene O'Neill's "Marco Millions," which opens next week.

Most Broadway plays rehearse for 3 weeks. "After the Fall" had runthroughs last summer and started rehearsals 3 months before opening night. "It wasn't really a play we began with," said Robards. "It was more like a large encyclopedia containing all the thoughts Miller had." Miller showed up almost every day to tell Director Kazan just what he wanted, and he even roughed out a

plasticine model of the play's thrusting set as a guide for Jo Mielziner. Thus the playwright has an unparalleled opportunity to shape his work as he envisioned it—and its confessional nature, its immediate excitement but its artistic failure, are Miller's own doing.

BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES

That sort of failure—having nothing to do with boxoffice receipts, which are quite good because of 46,500 presold subscriptions—is part of the repertory idea. "Success?" says Kazan. "I'm through with that crap game now. We feel we have an absolute right to errors. No one is on trial. No one is in danger." A play or an individual performer is free to feel his way, to grope toward the boundaries of talent, even to stumble beyond.

Most insular New Yorkers do not realize that their city is joining, not setting a trend. New York thinks it discovered Bertolt Brecht, for example; but San Francisco's Actor's Workshop had "Mother Courage" in its repertory for 7 years, long anticipating the Brecht vogue that later appeared off-Broadway. Sir John Gielgud is about to flash into Manhattan with a backstage modern Hamlet, but Sir Tyrone Guthrie was doing much the same a year ago in his new rep theater in Minneapolis, which is not to suggest that Guthrie invented modern-dress Hamlets, but merely that regional theater is now doing what New York does, and often some time ahead.

There are now, in fact, about as many first-rate professional rep companies as there are franchises in the American League. Among them:

The Seattle Center Playhouse, less than 3 months old, has three productions going in rotation "King Lear," "The Firebugs," "The Lady's Not for Burning," a fourth opening this week "Death of a Salesman," and Robert Ardrey's "Shadow of Heroes" in rehearsal for presentation April 1. "The plays running now are infinitely better than they were when they opened, and they continue to improve," says Director Stuart Vaughan. "That is the beauty of repertory." Operating in a theater built as part of the 1962 World's Fair, the company is heavily subscribed (10,000).

Milwaukee's Fred Miller Theater is battling odds and winning. The odds are Milwaukee itself, where the highest praise the drama critics know how to give is to compare the Miller's actors with the Green Bay Packers. But the Miller Theater is winning because of the extraordinary energy of its 29-year-old director, John Alexander McQuiggan. He has 10 players who do 8 shows in an October-April season. "The Hothouse" is the current draw, with Pirandello's "Right You Are If You Think You Are" coming next. "No one can direct eight shows," he says. "We bring in one man for each show and he shoots his wad." In the summer, McQuiggan raises money. What about the Ford Foundation? "That foundation has all the money and has no idea what's happening in the theater," he says, biting off all five fingers and half of the Ford palm. "They gave \$17,000 to some theater in San Francisco and nobody even knows where it is. I mean, they don't advertise or anything."

San Francisco's Actor's Workshop does advertise, but its 4,362 subscribers know where it is anyway. Of all U.S. rep companies (now that Greenwich Village's Living Theater is no longer living), this one has its head most completely immersed in cloud 8½. "We limit ourselves to what is not considered popular fare," says Director Jules Irving. "Our audience has to be patient with the kind of discoveries we make." Besides pioneering Brecht, the Workshop

was the first American theater to produce Harold Pinter, whose "Birthday Party" ran there for 3 years. It has a company of 13, frequently producing the works of unknowns. "We didn't spring full-blown like the Tyrone Guthrie Theater," says founder Irving, who comes from New York. "We're indigenous."

Minneapolis' Tyrone Guthrie Theater, established last year, did indeed spring full-blown—on a land grant plus \$400,000 from a local foundation, a \$337,000 Ford Foundation grant, and scattered donations that launched it in a \$2,250,000 theater. That Guthrie was eager to go to Minneapolis indicates the value placed on regional repertory by men of the theater: he was once artistic director of the Old Vic; he helped found the Shakespeare Festival at Stratford, Ont., and his name is a draw both on Broadway and the West End. The Minneapolis group reflects Director Guthrie's special flamboyance. Trumpets blare and drums roll before each performance. Laertes was running about last year with a .38 in his hand. In this season's "Henry V," the tide at Agincourt may well be turned by a hand grenade.

Memphis' Front Street Theater started 6 years ago in the bottom of an empty swimming pool (stage in the deep end, orchestra seats in the shallow), and has been trying to get out from under ever since. Now, with a rented theater, its debt is diminishing, and Founder George Touliatos, 34, hopes to surface this summer, can turn to what his theater ought to produce—"an American theater instead of a New York theater, doing plays born out of the social roots of the community." Meanwhile, he has been sweetening his ledger with things like "The Boy Friend" and "The Tender Trap."

Oklahoma City's Mummies Theater was started 15 years ago by Mack Scism, 36, a graduate in chemical engineering from the University of Oklahoma, who decided that the life of the stage was more interesting than cracking oil. Housed in an old warehouse, the Mummies have set some sort of record by being solvent from the start, especially since they produce Edward Albee and Samuel Beckett as well as surer things like "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," which closed a successful run last week. "A successful resident theater," says the Ford Foundation, "appears to be dependent upon a single driving, talented director or producer determined to have his own theater company and to have it in a particular place." Ford recently gave Scism \$1,250,000 to build a new theater.

Houston's Alley Theater is the oldest rep group of national importance. It was founded in 1947 by Nina Vance, a girl from Yoakum, Tex., who had decided she wanted to be a director but found that New York could not care less. "You know the story about how if you're in college and can't get into a sorority, you can always start your own," she says. "That's what I did." Her company occupies a converted electric-fan factory and does seven mixed-bag productions a year ("Harvey," Molière's "Imaginary Invalid," Chekhov), was an amateur group for 7 years before going Equity in 1954. In 1960 the Ford Foundation began giving the Alley \$2,000 a week to hire 10 professional actors and keep them there for at least three seasons. New York professionals rushed to the scene and stayed. The subscription roll has built to 4,500. And last year the Ford Foundation promised Nina Vance \$2,100,000 to get out of the fan factory—provided that she could raise another \$900,000 on her own. She did, and she is building two theaters: a 600-seater for the moneymakers and a 250-seater for art.

Dallas' theater center group is housed in a theater designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, which looks as if it had been chopped out of a Cunard liner. The theater center was opened in 1959. Its director is Paul Baker, once head of the widely acclaimed drama de-

partment at Baylor University. Among this season's productions are two new plays and such varied old ones as Robinson Jeffers' poetic drama "Medea" and Cole Porter's frolic "Can-Can."

Princeton University's McCarter Theater is one of only four professional rep groups that exist at U.S. colleges. Its 25-member company has a fall and a spring season (all Shakespeare this memorial spring), and is intended as a living library of theater: in 4 years at the university, an undergraduate can see performed examples of great drama from all periods.

The Guthrie Theater serves as a graduate study laboratory for the drama department of the University of Minnesota; a roving Equity group called the Association of Producing Artists is at the University of Michigan; and the theater group, founded by Producer John Houseman, is at UCLA.

Washington, D.C.'s Arena Stage, with 11,000 subscribers, has become "comfortably self-supporting," says Zeldia Fichandler, who founded it in 1950 just after taking her master's degree in drama from George Washington University. First playing in an old movie theater and later in a brewery, the arena was understandably known for a time as the old vat. New Yorkers used to snicker at it, but no longer. On scattered grants, contributions, and box office success, the arena built itself a stunning, 773-seat theater 2 years ago, which is as impressive as its solid no-star company. It likes revivals such as John Hersey's "The Wall" (now playing) and John Whiting's "The Devils."

America has thus been made safe for citizens who live and breathe theater. The Lincoln Tunnel is no longer a rainpout leading from the hanging gardens to the desert. And the most curious footnote to all this is that Broadway shows are having difficulty finding understudies. On the mere rumor of such an opening, six candidates would once have appeared like geni. But now "Luther," for example, is playing without a substitute Luther because almost every serious young actor who can walk or crawl has gone off to a rep company.

POVERTY—U.S.A.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President's call for a war on poverty has a great call on the imagination of the American people, and rightly so. It is intolerable that there should be millions of Americans leading substandard and hopeless lives in the midst of economic well-being unheard of in the annals of history.

That a war on poverty should be waged by our society is undeniable, but the strategy advanced so far by the administration is vague, lacks conceptual formulation, adequate funds, and organization. The problem yet remains to be defined. What causes these poor to remain in the lowest income brackets for indefinite periods? What is being done by State and local governments to meet this problem at the community level? How could existing Federal programs be modified to deal directly with rural poverty and poverty in our cities? What new programs could be devised to deal with the problem at the community level? These are just some of the questions that must be answered before an operation designed to affect the lives of 30 million Americans can really get off the ground.

The appointment of a coordinator at the Federal level to increase the effectiveness of existing Federal programs

represents a good beginning. In my view, however, the most effective approach mentioned thus far has been the maximum use of community-action-type programs tailored to the varied needs of individual communities across the country. There are numerous such community-action-type programs already in operation in various cities, including New York City. The \$13 million mobilization for youth which deals with the problems of the Lower East Side in New York City and the proposed \$80 million HARYOU plan to erase blight in Harlem, are just two examples in this regard. New Haven's Community Progress, Inc., is another successful project which operates in Connecticut.

There must also be a great emphasis on cooperative efforts between foundations, private voluntary organizations, universities, and State and local governments to tackle the problems of individual communities through projects tailored to the needs of these communities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Poverty—U.S.A.," from the February 17 issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY—U.S.A.: THE POOR AMIDST PROSPERITY

Lingering poverty in the shadow of unrivaled affluence is the painful paradox of American life today. In a single generation, the richest country on earth has banished the bleak specter of "The Grapes of Wrath" with the gilded fantasy of "The Beverly Hillbillies." But reality has hardly kept pace with the American dream.

Summoned now to Lyndon Johnson's "unconditional war on poverty," Americans can find the battlefield on all sides:

In a squalid Chicago slum, a Negro mother rages: "Why we got to go hungry and naked?" In forlorn Adair County, Okla., the State's poorest, a community leader wryly admits: "Welfare is our leading industry." In snow-cruled Portland, Maine, an arthritic old woman wearily fashions potholders to sell for 35 cents each and sighs: "Sickness takes the money so fast." In southern California's Imperial Valley, a leathery tomato harvester confides: "My highest thinking is not to lose hope. If I lose myself, I lose everybody." On a dreary Toledo street corner, a jobless youth unfit for the Army reports: "Christ, when I get a penny I squeeze it till the Lincoln jumps." And in Detroit, a wife struggling to support her unemployed husband and five children on \$60 a week laments: "Next month? I just don't know. Next month is in the hands of the angels."

LIVING ON RELIEF

On any given day, 430,000 men, women, and children—more than the entire population of Louisville, Ky.—live on relief in New York City, thousands of them in such appalling, vermin-ridden tenements that many have resorted to a desperate new tactic: the rent strike. In all, close to 8 million Americans are receiving public aid—\$400 million worth a month—and the number has been growing twice as fast as the population since 1955.

In the scarred hollows of Appalachia, there are hamlets so primitive that even an outhouse is an unknown luxury. In the South, half of all Negro farm families cling to survival on less than \$1,200 a year. In the dust of Three Rocks, Calif., a huddle of shanties in Fresno County, children gambol who have never seen a kitchen sink. American In-

dians still languish on reservations where the death rate is three times that of the United States at large. At precisely 11 each morning, 1,500 ragged people, some of them women clutching bedraggled youngsters, shuffle to St. Anthony's dining room in San Francisco for a free hot meal, generally their only one of the day.

What, after all, is new about poverty? The Bible says, "ye have the poor always with you"—and so far, even in America, it has been dead right. But in the United States at mid-century, poverty carries a special poignancy, a special frustration. For the first time in history, a society has attained the technological resources to wipe out poverty; yet, ironically, that very technology is aggravating the plight of the poor.

OUT OF STEP

And for the first time, in the midst of an unprecedentedly prosperous majority, America has been experiencing the phenomenon of minority mass poverty. A century ago, the overwhelming majority of Americans would have been deemed poor by today's standards. By the same yardstick, one out of every two Americans lived in poverty during the boom year of 1929. During the depression, Franklin D. Roosevelt's ragtag "one-third of a nation" was more closely two-thirds. But to be poor in America today is to be out of step with the Nation, a stranger in paradise, a frequently faceless member of an alien culture.

"The poor people feel that no one cares," says Paul Jacobs, a onetime labor organizer who recently roved the country on a Ford Foundation grant, disguised as a near-penniless drifter to gather firsthand impressions of unemployment and deprivation. "It's another world—there's their world and ours. They eat meat, and potatoes, and gravy—whoever heard of fruit or a salad? They get no mail—who writes to poor people? They sleep late—what's the sense of getting up? If you sleep late you might save the cost of a meal."

Ever since John Kenneth Galbraith pinpointed the anomaly of deprivation amid plenty in "The Affluent Society" 6 years ago, fellow economists have been haggling over the meaning of "poverty" and the precise dimensions of the problem in the United States. Reading the data by their own subjective lights, they have produced estimates ranging from an extravagant 90 million American poor—nearly half the population—to a hard-core minimum of 20 million living on the rind of bare subsistence. "The point," sociologist Michael Harrington says bluntly, "is that there are a hell of a lot of poor people in America today."

ONE-FIFTH

In its "war on poverty," under the generalship of Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver, the Johnson administration's count of the American poor is 35 million—nearly one-fifth of the Nation. It is an arbitrary figure, like any other, but virtually all experts agree that the figure is essentially realistic.

Who are the American poor and just how poor are they? "The people who are falling behind," says Galbraith, "fall into four classes. Those with poor education, those with physical or mental deficiency, those who live in the wrong geographical area, or those who have restricted job opportunities because of race. The most elementary fact about prosperity is that you have to have a job to participate in it."

The most elementary facts about American prosperity are staggering: After 35 straight months of expansion, the economy is generating a gross national product at the unprecedented rate of \$600 billion a year, 67.2 million people are employed, median family income stands at \$5,956 a year, up from \$4,117 in 1947. But when the income pie is sliced, 80 percent of the population feasts on 95 percent of it.

CX—194

THE OTHER AMERICA

The remaining sliver goes to the Nation's forgotten fifth—the citizens of what Harrington has christened (in the title of his 1962 study) "The Other America." Up-to-date figures show that more than 30 million Americans live in families with incomes of less than \$3,000 a year; more than half of them subsist on less than \$2,000—\$38 a week. Five million people living alone earn under \$1,500 a year.

Most poor families are white, live in cities, and are headed by a man or woman with no better than an eighth-grade education. When the figures are broken down, the characteristics that govern poverty U.S.A. make their mark.

City and country, nearly half—47 percent—of all poor families live in the South; indeed, a southerner's chances of being poor are twice those of Americans living elsewhere. Twenty-two percent of American poor families are Negroes or other nonwhites; a nonwhite family's chances of being poor are 2½ times greater than its white counterpart's. A quarter of all poor families are headed by women, a third by men or women over 65. Thirty percent have no breadwinners at all.

WHO ARE THE POOR?

In the United States there are 47 million families, 9.3 million earn less than \$3,000 annually. Of these: 5 million live in cities; 4.3 million live in the South; 6 million have a family head with less than ninth grade education; 2 million are nonwhite; 2.3 million have a woman as family head; and 3.2 million have a family head 65 or older.

Unquestionably, unemployment is a major thread in the pattern of Poverty U.S.A. By the latest count, 4.6 million Americans, 5.6 percent of the work force, are unemployed. Yet like all other individual aspects of the problem, unemployment in the conventional sense is only one part of the story. "Before," Galbraith points out, "we had poverty of the employables. Now we have poverty of some employables and many who are technically unemployable."

Thus, the spectrum of poverty in the United States begins at one end with the nouveau poor—industrial workers, thrust on the slag heap by automation or relocation of plants, who are slowly slipping into what they thought they had escaped forever. In the middle are the millions of low-paid, low-skill migrants, farm laborers, and service workers who simply cannot live on their often sporadic wages. And at the extremity are those too old, too sick, or too incompetent to hold jobs even if they had the chance. In an era of breathtaking technology, those who are left behind find it increasingly hard to make headway. "I think you're treated according to your education," says a bitter Negro mother in Chicago. "If you're unlucky and don't get one, or if you pass up the chance to get one, you have to suffer. You pay for it for the balance of your life."

Scanty education, ramshackle housing, faltering health, gnawing frustration—these are the effects of poverty and, in a vicious, stubborn cycle, the causes of more poverty.

Yet no capsule analysis of the dimensions and roots of the problem can begin to suggest the fascinating ambiguities that make American poverty so distinctly American. In every poverty pocket in the Nation jingles the small change of the affluent society.

STEREO ON RELIEF

In Harlan County, Ky., for example, the heartland of depressed areas, 88 percent of the families have washing machines, 67 percent have TV sets, 42 percent have telephones, and 59 percent own cars. On New York's Lower East Side, a Puerto Rican family living on relief is paying for a stereo phonograph set. In Stilwell, Okla., an old man lives on in a tar paper shack, serene in

the satisfaction that he has put every one of his children through college. A 1960 study found that 14 percent of families earning less than \$3,000 annually had bought new cars that year; nearly half the families making between \$2,000 and \$3,000 a year own their own homes.

As a class, the American poor live better today than ever before. And as a nation, America has made significant strides in reducing the percentage of poor in the general population—though in a rapidly growing population, the actual number of poor has been increasing. By the standards of the President's poverty advisers, 32 percent of all American families were poor in 1947. Within a decade, the figure had been cut to 23 percent. But since 1957, the pace has slackened. How to speed it up? That, in essence, is the problem facing the men who are now mapping the strategy of the "war on poverty."

With characteristic political élan, Lyndon Johnson has turned the phrase "war on poverty" into an evocative election-year slogan and a full-throated legislative battle cry. "In a way," says one top Washington official, "it's too bad the poverty program struck such a responsive chord with the public. This is a problem that will take decades—not just years—to handle, and I'm afraid people have been led to expect results overnight."

No one familiar with the complexities of the poverty cycle and the scope of the Johnson administration's efforts suffers from such utopian delusions. Indeed, hard-nosed authorities in and out of Government are frankly skeptical that the LBJ war on poverty as presently conceived will do more than attack the symptoms of an age-old affliction.

Few question Mr. Johnson's earnest concern for the plight of the poor. "The President has a great feeling for this program," says a Kennedy administration holdover in the White House. "It's close to his own roots. Where Kennedy may have had only an intellectual appreciation of the need to eradicate poverty, Johnson had a 'gut' reaction to the basic idea."

J.F.K.'S ROLE

Actually, Mr. Johnson's predecessor must get a substantial share of credit for whatever success the new urgent concentration on poverty U.S.A. eventually produces: it was John F. Kennedy's initiative that set the stage for the present drive, and Kennedy-fostered legislative proposals form the heart of the Johnson poverty program.

More than a year ago, the late President asked Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, for a copy of Michael Harrington's newly published, nontechnical report on poverty, "The Other America," and for the more scholarly analyses by economists like Leon Keyserling and Robert Lampman, a University of Wisconsin specialist on low-income families. Last June, Heller sent a note to Lampman: "What lines of action might make up a practical Kennedy antipoverty program?"

Armed with Lampman's guidelines, Heller recommended that the war on poverty be declared, and just 3 days before his death last November, the President gave his chief economic aid the go-ahead to rough out the order's. On the hectic weekend after the assassination, Heller briefed Mr. Johnson on the sketchy planning already undertaken. The new President seized on the idea as a logical extension of the Kennedy philosophy and—since the antipoverty strategy had not yet jelled—a program he could legitimately carry to the voters as his own.

Now, down the hall from newly designated poverty chief Sargent Shriver's fifth-floor offices at the Peace Corps, an eager handful of key planners—Washington insiders have already dubbed them the "Poor

Corps"—are trying to translate good intentions into meaningful reality. The atmosphere is enthusiastic, excited, often more than a little confused—distinctly reminiscent of the early days of the Peace Corps itself.

THE TEAM

Actually, Shriver and his brain stormers—among them Defense Department's Adam Yarmolinsky and Pat Moynihan of Labor, reinforced by intellectuals like Sociologist Harrington—are engaged in only one theater of the poverty war: getting more out of existing programs and developing new ones.

Integral to the war on poverty but essentially distinct from the efforts of Shriver and his "poverty office" is the \$11 billion-plus tax cut bill, which passed the Senate last week and is now in the hands of a House-Senate conference committee. As Mr. Johnson's advisers view the problem, no programs—no matter how ingenious—can make headway unless the sluggish economy is jogged and new jobs are created. The tax cut is counted on to do that, automatically winning part of the battle.

THE ARSENAL

A whole range of other programs—public works projects in Appalachia, housing and hospital construction, referral of draft-rejected youths to employment or health counselors, studies of the effects of automation and overtime pay—are part of the arsenal, yet not directly connected with the "Poor Corps."

Under the budget proposed by President Johnson, \$500 million will be spent by the Shriver office in the next 12 to 18 months. Half of this will be earmarked for new programs, including "community action" projects of all sorts in poverty pockets around the country. The rest will be spent on poverty-related aspects of existing manpower retraining, health, and employment programs technically under supervision of Cabinet departments. The key word is "coordination."

In practice, such bureaucratic differentiations would disappear. A typical community project might well involve Federal funds from a number of old and new programs, augmented by State, local, and perhaps private money. The initiative would come from the community itself in some cases; in others, the impetus would come from Washington—especially in areas themselves slow to fight the war on poverty.

PILOT PROJECTS

An outstanding sample community-initiated project is the 3-year, \$12 million youth salvage campaign in poverty-ridden Kanawha County, W. Va., announced last week by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, head of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. Other pilot programs on the drawing boards involve putting college students from low-income families to work as tutors for potential high school dropouts, and work projects for chronically unemployed men and women coupled with special reading, trade, or adult education classes.

Shriver is conscious of the conflict between those who would stress the jobs and public-works approach, and those who want to concentrate the available funds at first in a fixed number—perhaps 50 or 75—of community projects. By no means has he made all of his key decisions, but it is clear that both approaches will get attention.

"The community approach offers a great deal," says Shriver. "As a matter of fact, it's a great deal like Peace Corps projects overseas. But let me tell you this: I'm not at all interested in running a handout program, or a leaf-raking program, or a 'something for nothing' program. I don't know what we're going to come up with, but when we do, it will be a practical program."

No one doubts that the tireless, pragmatic Peace Corps chief will get the most he can out of the money at his disposal. But even those sympathetic to the intentions of the war on poverty harbor grave reservations about its small budget and limited scope.

"The money figures that are being talked about are utterly unrealistic in view of the goals authorized," grumbles Harrington. "New York could absorb that much just on the problem of the Negro. One billion wouldn't cover any one point in the programs President Kennedy originated."

NOT EVEN A DENT?

A high administration official says: "This threatens to be just a Band-Aid program. God knows it's worth while. Any increased effort to alleviate the pains of poverty is worth while. But until we crank up a massive effort to improve education, cut out the slums, clean out the narcotics rackets, we won't really make a dent in poverty. And don't forget: birth control figures heavily in this. I don't think we are prepared to do what is necessary in this area."

"This war on poverty," gibes Economist Oscar Ornati, "is one in which no general is willing to take a chance."

Another critic, Economist Keyserling, feels the essential point is being missed. "I do not believe that we have a distribution of income in the United States which makes it possible either to reduce unemployment substantially or to reduce poverty substantially," he insists. "You can't get rid of poverty, you can't expedite economic growth, you can't reduce unemployment by regressive budgetary policy, a tight-money policy, a nonspending policy, and a regressive redistribution of the national income through the tax mechanism."

"Free market" advocate Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago—a Goldwater adviser on occasion—has a more radical solution: a "negative income tax." The poor should be uplifted in a twinkling, he suggests, simply by giving them cash subsidies financed by the billions now spent piecemeal by Federal, State, and local agencies on New Deal-style welfare and poverty programs.

Thought provoking as they are, the points raised by Keyserling and Friedman are essentially academic in the face of current political realities. Lyndon Johnson, driving for a balanced budget, is unlikely to resort to massive increases in Federal spending; nor is America's basic commitment to a wide range of social-welfare programs likely to be abandoned in favor of an outright dole to the impoverished.

Indeed, the real problem facing the Johnson administration is how to wring a meaningful array of conventional poverty bills from a reluctant Congress. There are already more than a few ominous portents. Last week, a House committee flatly refused to expand the popular, proven food stamp program. Expansion of another Kennedy-inspired measure, the Area Redevelopment Administration, faces harsh prospects also; it is now bottled up in the House. With a Senate civil rights filibuster certain, the "poverty package" may well become a hostage of the southern bloc.

A POVERTY BLOC?

By the time the President's special poverty message reaches Congress next week or the week after, the southern tactics should be clearer. Harrington, for one, is convinced that the war on poverty is doomed unless Mr. Johnson recruits a coalition of his own: "a new, liberal, antipoverty congressional consensus cutting across party and sectional lines."

Shriver's first order of business these days is to draft the President's poverty message. He has leafed through a whole range of ideas from various Government agencies, solicited the views of business leaders and labor unions, and bounced the results off such trusted

friends as Yarmolinsky and Dick Goodwin of the Peace Corps. Last week, for example, he huddled with Economist John Kenneth Galbraith; Charles B. (Tex) Thornton of Litton Industries; C. Virgil Martin, president of Carson Pirie Scott & Co., Chicago department store; Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis; Donald Petrie, chairman of the executive committee of Avis Rent-a-Car; Lane Kirkland of the AFL-CIO; Henry Heald, president of the Ford Foundation; Harrington; labor specialist Paul Jacobs; Under Secretary of Agriculture James L. Sundquist; Richard Holton, Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and TV star Richard Boone, serving as a consultant on the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

"I come into this with an open mind," Shriver says. "I've been learning, sifting, and consulting—in just the way I did when I was trying to organize the Peace Corps. I don't mind going slow at the start. I feel that the way a program gets started is important to its ultimate success. So we'll start carefully."

What will be the measure of success? Some administration figures say they would be more than satisfied if the rate of reduction in the U.S. percentage of poor families could be stepped up to 1 percent a year, the pattern that prevailed from 1947 to 1956. But it would be years before such a trend could be gaged with any accuracy.

As the program gets underway, Shriver is characteristically realistic about its prospects. "I don't want anybody to get the idea that with \$500 million here in Washington we're going to cure the poverty problem in this country. Nobody thinks that," he says. "But we can do something."

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR ARAB REFUGEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, over the years the persistent efforts of UNRWA have led increasing numbers of Arab refugees along the road to resettlement. Its vocational training program has proved to be one of its most promising efforts and is undergoing rapid expansion. There are now about 10 training centers, most of them in Jordan, and they provide instruction in a number of trades for more than 4,000 refugees. Graduates of these vocational schools are needed to fill existing job vacancies in the Arab countries and despite obstacles these skilled workers readily find gainful employment. The United States provides some of the funds needed for this program but UNRWA is making an effort to enlist support from individuals for this eminently worthy cause. This year the United States has pledged to contribute \$24.7 million toward UNRWA's budget of \$38 million.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the information about this effort which I have excerpted from a booklet issued by UNRWA entitled "Opportunity."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM UNRWA'S OPPORTUNITY

Voluntary agencies and other groups, as well as private individuals who want to help, can best do so through UNRWA's vocational training scholarship program. The scholarship program, launched in 1961, aims to raise \$1 million a year from outside sources in the form of \$500 (£180) scholarships, each of which pays for 1 year's training for a young refugee, covering tuition, board and lodging, the use of the center's facilities, uniforms,

books and tools, and essential incidental expenses.

Now UNRWA is seeking to raise—and must raise—the sum of \$2 million a year in order to keep the vocational training program operating. Some of this, it is hoped, will be donated in the form of technical assistance funds and some in the form of individual scholarships to pay for a year's training for young refugees. Each scholarship costs \$500 (£180).

The agency's success in its expanded training program is evidenced by the fact that whereas in the 1959-60 academic year UNRWA operated 2 centers with a capacity of less than 600 trainees, it now has 10 centers of its own and provides training for more than 4,000 refugees.

For the past 2 years the U.S. Government has made a special contribution of \$1,700,000 toward the agency's educational program, over and above its regular annual contribution of \$23 million.

INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Gov. William L. Guy of North Dakota, made an important resource speech at the 45th annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association in New Orleans on February 3, 1964. Governor Guy presented a strong case for a continuing integrated developmental program for the Missouri River Basin. The Governor pointed out that the State of North Dakota has in the past made a number of sacrifices in the loss of land revenue for the development of flood control protection for States further south in the basin.

The Governor noted that today North Dakotans are seeking the support for Garrison diversion from those States who have previously been the recipients of flood control protection from reservoirs such as Garrison in North Dakota. As the Governor said:

North Dakota certainly is pleased that it has contributed full support to river navigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water, electric power generation, and to other States' irrigation. We simply say that we will stand with you in the future. We hope that you will stand with us in obtaining irrigation through reauthorization of the Garrison diversion unit.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Guy's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM L. GUY, OF NORTH DAKOTA, 45TH ANNUAL MEETING, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, NEW ORLEANS, LA., FEBRUARY 3, 1964

Water means the same thing to everyone. It is something which flows out of a faucet when you turn it on. It can be drunk in its natural state or it can be frozen to add palatability to other things that can be drunk. It can be mixed with dirt to form mud for overshoes, or it can be mixed with soap to take mud off of floors, overshoes or even faces. It has such fantastic properties that men have written hundreds of books about water through the centuries. But, to most of us it is still what drips out of a faucet with a loose gasket. Water seldom seems precious, and yet the last cupful of water on earth would be valued more than the earth itself.

Rivers, however, are vastly different from water. Rivers are to sit by—or to swim in. Rivers are for sailing up or down. Rivers are for getting across and then getting back again. Rivers are for dumping garbage in and composing songs about their beauty. Rivers are for fishing in or falling in. Rivers are for freezing, or for flooding, or for running dry. Rivers can be an economic blessing or they can be brutally negative in their economic impact. Rivers can provide transportation and they can obstruct transportation. Rivers can weld political subdivisions together in common goals, or they can be sharply divisive between cities or even States. Rivers can be used and developed as private property, or they can respond to treatment under public policy. Rivers can be and do pretty much what man makes of them.

We have not always had public policy as it pertains to water and rivers, but public policy in water resource development and conservation is playing a larger role each year. Some folks might say that public policy in water resource development started in 1803 when President Thomas Jefferson bought a vast drainage basin—the Louisiana Purchase. Certainly the most important event of Jefferson's administration was the purchase of the vast territory of Louisiana from Napoleon in 1803. President Jefferson called in two army captains by the names of Lewis and Clark, and ordered them to examine his recent purchase. The two intrepid explorers, I am sure, gulped a few times, saluted smartly and headed northwest by the most logical transportation of the times—the Missouri River.

The Missouri River Basin was a wilderness, but even at that time the value of the basin must have cast a shadow before. The flights of ducks and geese were a clue to the strategic location of the Missouri River as the great central flyway for waterfowl of the continent of North America. Some of you may be interested in knowing that in good years, the State of North Dakota produces about 80 percent of the domestically produced wild waterfowl—ducks and geese—in the United States.

The slap of Lewis' and Clark's canoe paddles sent grazing deer crashing through the willow and cottonwood thickets along the flood plain of the Missouri. These lush lowlands between the bluffs that stand up so beautifully along this valley proved that the river offered a natural sanctuary for wildlife running for hundreds of miles. The bare, grassy plains extended out on either side of the valley for as far as the eye could see. The width of the river and its majestic sweeping bends must have suggested that this river had a great potential for river navigation in the future. The silty, yellow water gouging new channels among constantly changing sand bars was an indication of the senseless brute power and the soil-wasting extravagance of this big river and all of its tributaries.

But the peaceful agricultural plots of the farming Mandan Indian tribes, where Bismarck and Mandan, N. Dak., thrive today, must have given a clue to the agricultural value of this whole flood plain if it were cleared of its brush and trees. To Lewis and Clark the Missouri River, even with its treacherous currents and eddies, must have seemed like a very real main street into the Great Northwest.

The Missouri River with its tributaries was one vast integrated drainage system. This was the significant thing about the river at that time—both the Mississippi and the Missouri. It was an integrated river system of main stem and tributaries. It was to be a vast integrated drainage system in the eyes of mother nature until the westward advance of the surveyor's rod could lay out the system of political subdivisions. These political subdivisions were the sections, the

townships, the counties and, of course, even the States.

When this happened, the Big Muddy and its tributaries were still an integrated drainage system to mother nature, but it became a completely segmented water system to all of the political subdivisions that were newly formed by the surveyor's rod. To some, the water was a blessing—to others it was a destructive and treacherous foe. The destruction of floods downstream had to be controlled hundreds of miles upstream where there was little interest in the problem of flooding. Destruction of flooding downstream could be controlled only by upstream dams and the accompanying inundation of the reservoir bottom lands.

It is no wonder that the State of North Dakota, with one-half million acres inundated by main stem reservoirs, would find little enthusiasm for solving the flood problems of Iowa and Nebraska. It is understandable that the State of Montana, with its dramatically beautiful, churning white water, would have little interest in the level of navigational waters that were flowing along the States of Kansas and Missouri. What would cause private utility customers in Minnesota to be interested in the Federal hydropower being generated for REA customers in South Dakota or for the public power customers of Nebraska? Obviously, the integration of water resource development in the Missouri Basin was to take more than the individual application of any one of the 10 States lying wholly or in part within this drainage basin. The Federal Government had to be the one to act as a common denominator in a water development program as vast as that represented by the Missouri drainage water development projects, and it was necessary that private citizens initiate action and generate broad vision among leaders in all States in the river basin. The Mississippi Valley Association has done a remarkable job in this respect.

The first step in taming the Big Muddy was the construction of multipurpose dams. These multipurpose dams had to furnish a spectrum of benefits to be justified to the greatest number of people. There is no doubt that the wild, destructive Missouri has been tamed. The question remains, however, as to how well and how completely this tamed giant can be put to work. Many benefits are dramatic in their impact, and they are easily seen. The silt-laden water is no longer added to farmlands and spread through flooded cities downstream. But the clear water flowing through our main stem dams has a silt-absorbing quality which is requiring bank stabilization downstream. The barge traffic reaches further north than ever before, and is assured of water under keels for more weeks in the year than at any time in the past. Cities and industries downstream can plan and expand with confidence—confidence that a constant water supply will be theirs.

Pollution control and flushing have made great strides in assuring people and industry of uncontaminated waters. A blooming water recreation industry has confounded even the most optimistic of 10 years ago. It was only natural that the tremendous heads of latent power in reservoir storage should be released in an orderly manner which could turn the huge turbines to provide low-cost hydro-generated power to preference customers and private utilities throughout the Midwest area. An excellent job has been done in integrating the water resources of the Missouri Basin to date.

One discordant note still remains in this symphony of harmonious river benefits. That discordant note is the failure to partially offset, by means of irrigation, some of the economic losses so graciously sustained by upstream States so that downstream benefits might become a reality. If the Missouri River drainage basin lay all in one State, the pluses and minuses of river development

would average out to a new high plateau of gains in that particular State.

However, the Missouri Basin drainage area does not lie within one State. The pluses and minuses are distributed unequally among many political subdivisions. The economic losses projected into the future become even more important to an affected political subdivision, such as a State. These losses become compounded as each year passes. States are required to furnish services to their people. When a State gives up a substantial portion of its economic base for the benefit of people in another State, then the losing State has not kept faith with its own. To absorb such losses to the individual States, a timetable of water resource development in the Missouri Basin was supposed to offset losses with gains as soon as possible. Such has not always been the case.

The mighty Missouri bottomland that once furnished the headquarter units for hundreds of ranches and dryland farms has been completely inundated in North Dakota. This inundation of more than half a million acres has also destroyed the sanctuaries of wild game which had made our State a hunter's paradise. A study by the North Dakota State University conservatively estimates that the annual net loss of more than \$18 million in economic productivity is North Dakota's subsidy of downstream Missouri water resource development. Today, we North Dakotans seek your help in driving for such irrigation projects as the Garrison diversion unit in our State, the Oahe project in South Dakota, and the Mid-State project in Nebraska.

We admit, as North Dakotans, that in the many years past it has been some of our water that has flowed downstream, causing the havoc of flooding in other States. In years past, it might be said that the States downstream were subsidizing some of the drainage in North Dakota. Now, the coin is turned and North Dakota is subsidizing the developments downstream to quite a substantial sum of money in terms of North Dakota economics. North Dakota has sought unsuccessfully to recover only a portion of its annual loss through using some of its own Missouri River water to irrigate dryland acres.

The Garrison diversion irrigation project is economically feasible. It would bring water to land now in full production of surplus cash grain crops. I think this is significant. Oftentimes, reclamation means bringing desert lands into production, but the reclamation we are talking of is the reclaiming of lands which are now productive. In this instance, we are talking of changing the type of agriculture on lands that are now productive, but not as productive as they could and should be in the type of agriculture which is in growing demand—that of producing the animal protein and noncereal foods. This irrigation would bring the stability necessary to convert some of these surplus cash grains into livestock production crops consistent with growing consumer demands for animal protein food. Because of the lag in the completion of the Garrison diversion irrigation project, North Dakota can never fully recover its annual cash contribution to water resource development to other States in the Missouri Basin.

Quite simply, what I am saying is that because irrigation projects extend in their construction phases over so many years, the State of North Dakota can never hope to reclaim, even through the increased production of irrigation projects, the losses that it incurs annually as a member of the integrated Missouri River Basin system.

Missouri Basin water resource development is a bittersweet thing. It is a sweet thrill and a pleasure to see the improvement and development of benefits all along the main stem and far up into the tributaries. It is

bitter to see the areas which already have accomplished benefits lose interest in or even refuse to recognize the negative impact that remains in other political subdivisions of the Missouri River Basin. The only real justification for looking toward economic advantages from water resource development is that of providing productive jobs for people. Until we have committed every drop of Missouri Basin water for productive use consistent with the need to spread benefits as equitably as possible among States, we are falling to follow through on a thrilling project that can furnish increasing job opportunities to those of each generation who have the right to believe that our economic system can expand job opportunities consistent with our rise in population.

This great river can be a positive influence in the affairs of every State it touches. There is great need for all thinking people to look at multistate water development as a problem which has a different and separate impact on each State involved. We as river States must present a united front formed from unselfish points of view. North Dakota pledges her support to complete water resource development in the Missouri Basin and in the total Mississippi Basin.

Just in the short 10 years or so that North Dakotans have been involved in river development on the Missouri, I think we have seen evolution of thinking of people, not only in this State but all over the United States.

I was impressed recently in listening to a woman judge from New York City who spoke in Fargo, N. Dak. She spoke of the despondency and frustration of hundreds of thousands of youthful, employable people below the age of 21. She spoke of the fact that the absorption of young people into productive work is becoming a very difficult problem.

All over the United States, people are becoming aware that even though we might be the most affluent society on the earth, we have a definite responsibility to see that people get a part of this affluent society and are employed at an early age of adulthood. River development, whether it be in the Missouri River or any other river basin, is part of the challenge of employing people. As proud as we are of the initiative and drive that there is in our type of capitalistic system, we are nevertheless fully justified as a Federal Government and a State government to do what is necessary to develop our natural resources so that they can contribute to the further growth of our capitalistic system.

The Missouri River and the Mississippi River, I think, provide a provocative source of expansion of free enterprise and the capitalistic system up and down the rivers and in every State they touch.

I believe that the Nation is becoming more aware of all water development potential. When I look ahead in the coming years, I see less difficulty in obtaining programs to conserve natural resources, particularly water.

When we look back at the short span of time since the great economic crash of 1928, we are looking back at the same interval of time we face between now and the year 2000. In this short period of time ahead, we must plan the opportunities for satisfying lives for almost double our present population. By the year 2000 we can expect 350 million citizens in the United States. By that time, people will be working an average of 32 hours a week and will have 30 days of annual vacation.

On this past Christmas night some of you may have seen an NBC television documentary of life in Calcutta, India. Here is a city of 6 million people drowning in its own garbage. Three hundred thousand people live permanently on the cement sidewalks and streets. Each morning the night's crop of dead are collected. This tribute to squalor,

poverty, and disease is the result of a single city and its nation being unable to plan its own destiny.

Social costs to India of her failures in planning are repeated all over the globe. No nation enjoys immunity from the degradation and hopelessness that accompanies a failure to recognize the necessity of not only economic planning but social planning as well. We can talk proudly of States rights and responsibility, but we should remember that it is from Calcutta's wound that India's life blood is flowing. Our Nation can no longer use Horace Greeley's advice of "Go west, young man, go west" as its great answer to the social problems of poverty, employment and economic growth. We need to recognize our Nation's maturity and the need to plan the development of opportunity for all of our people.

Water resource development is much more than cost-benefit ratios and dollars and cents; it is also a challenge to social planning. The use of clean water in residences, industries and recreation in the years ahead has strong social overtones. The spreading of industry and irrigation farming over extensive areas also has important sociological ramifications. Time is shorter than we realize to get on with long-range planning. Public works projects take years in planning and construction.

North Dakota certainly is pleased that it has contributed full support to river navigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water, electric power generation, and to other States' irrigation.

We simply say that we will stand with you in the future. We hope that you will stand with us in obtaining irrigation through reauthorization of the Garrison diversion unit.

MEAT IMPORT AGREEMENTS TO SURRENDER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, less than a week ago it was my privilege to speak at the National Conference on Foreign Trade in Meats sponsored by the National Livestock Feeders Association, in St. Louis, Mo. My remarks entitled "How Much of a Rollback on Beef Imports?" were addressed to negotiations then underway by our State Department with several principal importers into the United States of beef and veal products. At that time I pointed out that agreements with foreign countries, to serve any useful purpose, would have to provide for a substantial rollback in import quotas, preferably not more than the level of imports for the 1958-62 average. This average would come to about 6.5 percent of annual U.S. consumption.

Yesterday the terms of the agreements with Australia and New Zealand were announced. They are sad and discouraging. They were described as a "rollback" to the average imports for the years 1962-63.

This is no rollback; it is surrender.

Such an agreement fastens on the cattle industry as well as other parts of American agriculture the import levels that contributed so heavily and ruinously to the cattle price break of the past 12 months. These agreements will help to make permanent a condition which has proved to be almost unbearable in the past 12 months because of the further provision that a growth factor of 3.7 percent is attached to the quality of imports allowed.

RECENT AND SHARP IMPORT GROWTH

In the past 10 years Australian beef and veal imports to the United States increased by more than thirty-two thousand percent. In the past 5 years they jumped from 18 million pounds to 517 million pounds of veal and beef, with a very small percentage of mutton. The average for the period 1958-62 was 213 million pounds. The quotas set by the agreement, are 542 million pounds in 1964; 562 million in 1965; and 582 million pounds in 1966. These increasing figures are accounted for by the growth factor of 3.7 percent for each following year after 1964. As a "rollback," this situation is cruelly mislabeled and misnamed.

The total of beef and veal imports which we are talking about for 1963 came to about 1,750 million pounds, which is roughly some 11 percent of the year's consumption. This poundage represents the beef from somewhere between 3½ to 4 million head of cattle, depending somewhat on who is doing the calculating.

DROP IN FARM INCOME

Mr. President, had this number of cattle been produced entirely in the United States, they would have consumed more than 20 billion pounds of feed grain equivalent—most of it in surplus feed grain. This demonstrates that the serious situation at hand is not one of the cattle raiser or the cattle feeder, but of all agriculture. Mind you, during 1963 there was a drop in farm income of 3 percent, while the general consumer income increased 5 percent. For 1964 the picture is even more glum because the Department of Agriculture's present estimate is a further 5-percent drop in farm income this year.

One of the greatest single factors in the disappointing 1963 income cut was the heavy reduction of cattle prices; and one of the chief (in the minds of some, the chief) factors in their drop were the imports from foreign nations. True, the number of cattle in the United States stand at a high figure; but over many years, the cattle industry and the nation have worked their way out of similar high cattle population. But with today's size, type, persistence, and threatening future of cattle imports, we have a different problem altogether.

The agreements between the United States on the one hand and Australia and New Zealand on the other, are a sore disappointment and setback to the cattle industry and all related industries as well. It is obvious that they do nothing to solve or even lighten the problem. Indeed, they worsen it. As the months of catastrophically low prices dragged on, pressures have built up for effective action of some kind. Apparently the administration felt it had to show some sort of action to satisfy the stockmen and others involved. Apparently it was desperate for some agreement, any kind of agreement, which could be presented to the country as a solution. The announced agreements are the result, but obviously they will not do the job.

They build into the cattle industry a high, unfair, and an intolerable factor of even a greater cattle population than

ever before, with this exception: That part of the added millions of cattle which will be needed to produce 3½ to 4 million head of cattle annually—to furnish the imports allowable under the agreements—will be grown in the exporting countries. There they will consume foreign-produced feed, laborers and management will be from those countries, taxes will be paid there, and so on. Yet their impact on the U.S. market will continue to the detriment of the American farmer. It is an impact that has proved difficult to live with during these past 12 months. It will become increasingly burdensome and unacceptable in the years ahead.

COLD DAY FOR STOCKMAN

Mr. President, yesterday was a cold day in February for the American stockman. Indeed, for all of American agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that extracts from my remarks in St. Louis on February 12 to the National Conference on Foreign Trade in Meats, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, Mr. President, the Omaha World-Herald is rendering a valuable public service in a series of articles by Darwin Olofson and Howard Silber dealing with the disastrous course of cattle prices of this past year, with the beef import situation, and other aspects of the problem. This series started on Sunday. I ask unanimous consent that the first two articles of the series be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the extracts and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH OF A ROLLBACK ON BEEF IMPORTS?

(Extracts from remarks of ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. Senator from Nebraska, prepared for delivery at the National Conference on Foreign Trade in Meats, St. Louis, Mo., Feb. 12, 1964)

We have arrived at the climactic point in a long campaign—a campaign of education and agitation to push and persuade the administration to do something concrete about these mounting imports of beef. Most of last year the Department of Agriculture spent insisting that beef imports had nothing at all to do with the price of cattle. But the more they insisted, the more beef came in, and the farther prices fell.

Now the Department has finally conceded that something must be done about imports. Something, but how much? And when? Those questions are still not answered.

You are all aware that beef imports increased more than 3½ times between 1957 and 1962—and then increased some more in 1963. The exact percentage of increase in 1963 is not available yet, but apparently it will be nearly 15 percent over 1962, which was the alltime record year up to that time.

Unless we can secure a substantial rollback from the high levels of the last 2 years, we know that imports in such heavy volume will continue to depress our cattle markets.

AVAILABLE AVENUES TO COMBAT IMPORTS

I. Government purchases

A very limited fund is available for purchases of surpluses to be used in the school lunch program and for distribution to the

needy. This program cannot possibly have any big or effective impact on the problem; it is too small. Last fall, 33 million pounds of frozen ground beef were bought for the school lunch program, but, of course, that is just a drop in the bucket as against an annual beef and veal production rate totaling over 17 billions of pounds.

II. Tariff Act

Escape clause: If an industry proves injury to the required degree as a result of imports, it is possible that relief under the 1962 Export Trade Act, in the form of technical assistance to convert to production of a new item, tax benefits, special unemployment allowances, training benefits to workers, etc.

This is obviously unfitted and not applicable to cattle industry.

Not a single domestic applicant under this clause has been granted relief under this clause of the 1962 act. Every applicant has been turned down.

National security clause: If damage to national security is shown to the satisfaction of the Office of Emergency Planning (not the Tariff Commission in this case), relief can be granted. Of the large number of applications filed, only one industry has been given help—the petroleum industry—on crude petroleum and certain products. So there is not much hope here.

Investigation under section 332: This section provides for an investigation only. Its only purpose would be to secure an impressive report which may or may not be helpful from a public relations standpoint in securing remedial action of some other sort. But in and of itself, such investigation does not lead directly to any relief. Such an investigation is now underway by the Tariff Commission in regard to beef and beef products being imported. Hearings are scheduled for April 28. Every effort should be made to prepare a very complete and convincing case.

III. Section 22—Agricultural Act

It provides that import quotas may be imposed on products with price supports. This is of no value since cattle do not have any such supports. No cattlemen, and nobody else that I know of, want them to have such support. Good riddance.

IV. International agreements

A. International commodity agreements, by treaty: This has been resorted to in the case of wheat and coffee, for example. Such an agreement would take a long time. It might conceivably include the element of production controls for the U.S. producer. The ugly head of supply management under any guise, national or international, is not a welcome sight. We can do without it.

B. Bilateral agreements: For example, between Japan and the United States on textiles, and in some instances on cotton garments. They are voluntary and are partially at least designed to prevent a public outcry in the United States which might produce more severe action or restriction.

C. Section 204—Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended: President may negotiate agreements limiting imports of any agricultural product or textiles or textile products. In 1962, the act was amended to add: If a several-nation agreement has been entered into "accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles" being imported, then the President may take steps to limit imports from nonagreement countries who are also importing that same item.

Section 204 Agreement—Greatest Hope
It is on this avenue that the greatest hope for progress rests.

It is the most suitable and most practical. It has been used for cotton textiles. It can be resorted to with speed and with substantial degree of hope for success, if pressed vigorously and resourcefully.

The 1962 amendment was enacted to give effectiveness to otherwise partial agreements for import quotas.

The Mundt-Hruska amendment (to H.R. 10788) proposed that the cotton textile agreements would not go into effect until similar international agreements had been negotiated with respect to beef, veal, and other products. It failed of passage.

The Hruska bill (S. 2168) introduced in 1963 would direct the President to initiate negotiations for international agreements on beef, veal, lamb, and mutton under section 204. No action has been taken or scheduled on this bill as yet. The Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to any legislative approach.

What Should Import Volume Be?

Last year, total beef imports—in all forms—amounted to between 1,600 million and 1,700 million pounds, carcass weight equivalent. That excludes live cattle. Seven years ago—1957—they were less than 400 million pounds. That was between 2 and 3 percent of our total consumption. Before then, annual imports were even smaller.

American cattlemen have not asked that imports be cut off completely. Neither have we asked that they be cut back to the levels of 1957 and before. We recognize that a certain amount of trade is reasonable and desirable with Australia, which is one of our closest friends and allies.

One suggestion has been that imports be set at the average level of 1958 to 1962. Of course, every year during that 5-year period showed large imports, so it would not be a low base period. Average imports for that period were 1,045 million pounds, equal to about 6.7 percent of our own production.

Certainly that seems reasonable—high, if anything. It would represent a rollback of about 600 million pounds a year—enough to give a good deal of strength to the cattle market.

How have the negotiations been proceeding? Just before I left Washington, I tried to take a check on that. Progress was being made, I was told, but that is about all I was told.

The trouble is, we got off to a soft start on the thing. The Australians got the jump on us by saying, "We will be agreeable to fixing the import quotas at 1963 levels plus a growth factor of 2 or 3 percent."

Of course, that wouldn't be any settlement at all; it would be surrender. We need a substantial rollback to do us any real good.

Now, if we can't make any headway by negotiation, we'll have to take congressional action. Frankly, congressional action now to arm the executive branch with additional powers would strengthen our hand immeasurably in the negotiations. I say this: If there is a good faith effort made by the Secretary of Agriculture and by the President, our negotiations will be successful. But when the Secretary of Agriculture constantly opposes legislation and refuses to secure that compulsory power as a means of dealing with the Australians, Australia assumes that we really don't intend to press hard for a fair agreement.

V. Legislative action

As a last resort in case other methods fail, Congress could enact legislation placing flat import quotas, by quantity spelled out or by formula given in percentage of production or in similar fashion.

This would indeed be doing it the hard way. It is seriously urged and earnestly hoped that it will not be necessary to resort to it.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Sunday World-Herald, Feb. 16, 1964]

THE CATTLE CRISIS—BEEF IMPORTS TRAMPLE ECONOMY OF MIDLANDS—WORLD-HERALD SURVEY FINDS FEEDERS FACE RUIN

(By Howard Silber and Darwin Olofson)

The U.S. cattle industry is sick.

The affliction begins at the ranch and extends into virtually every segment of the economy of the midlands.

In the middle—and hardest hit to date—is the cattle feeder, the man who uses grain and know-how to convert the lean range animal into luscious steaks and tender roasts.

The typical feeder is a Corn Belt farmer. In some cases he may be a southerner, a Coloradan, or a Californian.

Wherever he is, whoever he is, he lost money, or at best broke even, in 1963, on every creature he marketed. His 1964 prospects are no better.

And unless the trend changes quickly and dramatically, the cattle producer—the rancher and the farmer who breeds beef animals—will be far worse off this year than he was in 1963.

Across the country, 1963 was a good crop year. But the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported farm income declined 3 percent—while general consumer income climbed 5 percent.

TIDE OF IMPORTS DEVASTATING

And the USDA is predicting that agricultural income will take another plunge this year. The estimate is 5 percent.

Largely responsible is the sickness of the cattle industry.

In the Omaha livestock market, the largest and most important in the United States, the average price of fat steers during the week ended February 6 was down 15 percent from the level of the first week of February in 1963. The average price of fed heifers was down 12½ percent.

And most feeders say they lost money, or barely broke even, on cattle they sold a year ago.

As for replacement stock—the animals that will soon be taken from range and pasture to be fattened on corn, sorghums, and other grain—Kansas State University reports their prices are down between 10 and 20 percent.

Cattlemen, economists, bankers, and other agriculture experts agree that there are two principal reasons for the ruinous conditions:

A devastating and continually rising tide of imports which, in 1963, saw a record of 1,750 million pounds of foreign beef swamp the U.S. market. This quantity, converted into steaks, roasts, hamburger, stew meat, processed meat and other beef table products, would supply the beef needs of every American family for more than a month.

Too many cattle here at home.

The two causes are interrelated. Experts believe a reduction in beef imports would help reduce the size of domestic herds. But more about that later.

FEEDLOTS—RANCHES—MEXICO

For more than a month, two World-Herald staff writers and the newspaper's chief photographer have been taking a hard look at the beef crisis.

They have visited feedlots and ranches of the Corn Belt, the Mountain States and the Southwest. They have crossed the dry border from southern California into Mexico. They have crossed the Rio Grande at several points.

They have talked with cattlemen, financiers, meatpackers, economists—as well as importers, purveyors of imported beef, and foreign cattlemen.

They have filled a dozen notebooks, made scores of photographs.

Their findings—the story of the destructive effects of unrestrained imports of beef on the cattle industry of the United States and on the economy of the Nation—are presented in this series of articles.

A total of 1,750 million pounds is a lot of beef.

Depending on who does the calculating, it is the equivalent of between 3,500,000 and 4 million cattle on the hoof.

Had these animals been produced entirely in the United States, they would have consumed more than 20 billion pounds of feed grain equivalent—mostly surplus feed grain.

Had these cattle been produced in this country, the process would have provided more than 1 million additional man-hours of gainful labor in a nation which is fighting a serious unemployment problem.

Most of the imported meat came from Down Under. Australia and New Zealand accounted for 67 percent of the total.

BEEF OWN WORST COMPETITOR

Australia is the giant. In 10 years the Aussies have increased their shipments of beef and veal to the United States by more than 32 thousands percent, customs records show. In the last 5 years, the product weight—net weight—of Australian beef has rocketed from 18 million to 517 million pounds. New Zealand hasn't stood by idly. Its tonnage of beef consigned to the United States increased by some 16 hundred percent in the same decade.

Ireland and Mexico rank third and fourth as exporters of beef to the United States.

U.S. cattlemen say the imported beef competes directly with the American product. The economists agree.

Most of the beef which enters this country is of standard or utility grade, used primarily for hamburger, lunch meat, sausage and the like. Nevertheless it has a depressing effect on the fat cattle market.

Added influence comes from the fact that beef competes with beef. It is generally regarded as its own worst competitor.

Floyd Segel, president of the Wisconsin Packing Co., Milwaukee, provided the World-Herald with this illustration:

"If you've just eaten meatloaf—made with foreign beef hamburger—there's no room in your stomach for beefsteak."

And low-grade imported meat has a subtle but serious effect on cattle production in the United States. Cows are a normal source of manufacturing meat. With cheaper foreign beef flooding the United States, domestic cow prices at the packinghouse have been poor.

ONE LESS BITE CONSUMED

As a result, instead of culling many old cows from their herds, ranchers have left them around for another year to get still one more hundred-dollar calf from them. The result: more calves on the range and, in turn, more animals crowding the feed bunkers.

Dr. Everett Peterson, University of Nebraska agricultural economist, commented on this situation:

"When the packer has to compete more vigorously for the old cow we'll see a decline in our overall cattle numbers."

Roland R. Renne, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Affairs, noted that production of fed beef in the United States was 11 percent higher in 1963 than in 1962.

"When, to this heavy increase in domestic production of beef during 1963, is added the increase in imports," he declared, "it is clear why beef cattle prices were appreciably lower in 1963 than in 1962."

James J. Regan, Jr., of Omaha, who has extensive ranching and cattle-feeding interests, summed up the effect of booming beef imports:

"Every time someone takes a bite of foreign beef one less bite of American beef is consumed."

AUSTRALIAN MEAT SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES

Four ships left Australia in late November and early December with 13,865,600 pounds of beef, 2,755,200 of mutton, 29,120 of lamb, and 42,560 of variety meats for the United States.

lar establishment and the cattle feeder commonly tallies his livestock in thousands.

"Because we're so big compared with the farmer-feeder of the Corn Belt, our losses are proportionately higher," said Richard Kershaw, of Brawley, Calif. "We believe we operate efficiently, but we're losing money on every head of cattle we feed.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture told in a recent report how much the feeders—all the Don Fosters, Darrell Jensens, and Dick Kershaws—have been hurt.

The farmer, who fed a steer calf to choice weight during the 1962-63 cycle, said the Department, marketed the animal for an average of \$1.46 more than the direct cost of the calf and the feed it ate, plus transportation and marketing expenses.

The \$1.46 had to take care of such things as interest on the bank loan which made the purchase of the calf possible, depreciation of equipment and improvements, taxes, insurance, death losses, water costs, and of course, labor.

It didn't come close.

ALL THIS, AND BOBBY BAKER

The \$1.46 was not extreme. The same study showed that the feeder who purchased a yearling steer in the fall of 1962 and marketed it the following spring at choice weight took an average direct loss of \$20.12 a head. Here again the statisticians admittedly ignored interest, overhead, and labor.

The cattle rancher has only one real market for his product—the farm and feedlot. His problems began with the drop in the price of fed cattle, but he didn't feel them directly until about a year later, last year.

As a result, he is slightly better off than the feeder—just slightly, and temporarily, say the cattle finance men and economists.

"The producer faces a deficit in 1964. Some of us lost last year, too," said Brooks J. Keogh, Minot and Keene, N. Dak., rancher and president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. "Prices we receive are down. We didn't feel the pinch as early as the feeder, but we feel it now."

This is more than the story of Don Foster, Darrell Jensen, Dick Kershaw, and Brooks Keogh.

It is the story of the entire cattle and beef industry—in the ranching areas of the West and Southwest; in the Corn Belt, Far West, and Great Lakes States; in the rapidly developing cattle areas of the Deep South, and lower Atlantic seaboard.

It is also the story of the man who has learned to pilot a small airplane to increase his speed and efficiency when he checks the bores—we call them wells—of a vast cattle station in Australia's dusty, horizonless outback.

It is the story of the farmer of New Zealand's fat Canterbury Plains whose product will make its way to a Boston or Denver restaurant which features T-bone steak dinners for \$1.29.

It is the story of the handsome Mexican engineer who now uses his logarithm tables to check the probable weight gain of the cattle in the feedlots he oversees.

And the story has many other characters. They run the gamut from the headline-making Bobby Baker to the honest, hard-working operator of a small food market in your neighborhood.

All have a role in the story of the tremendous quantity of imported beef that is flooding the United States and its effects on the American rancher and farmer and on the economy of the Nation.

DOWN, DOWN, DOWN

This table from the U.S. Department of Agriculture shows what has happened to the price of fed cattle. It gives the prices—per hundredweight—for steers and heifers sold

Ship and sailing date	Destination ¹	Arrival date	Cargo	Quantity
WESTERN PORTS				
Ellen Bakke, Nov. 30	Seattle	Jan. 19	Beef	293,440
	Tacoma	Jan. 21		
	Portland	Jan. 25	Beef	206,080
	Los Angeles	Jan. 31	do	134,400
	San Francisco	Feb. 5	do	407,680
EASTERN AND GULF PORTS				
Lake Ontario, Dec. 7	Norfolk	(?)	do	33,600
	Tampa	Jan. 4	do	1,173,760
Wharanui, Dec. 11			Mutton	288,960
			Lamb	29,120
			Various meats	13,440
	Charleston	Jan. 9	Beef	44,800
			Mutton	302,400
	Philadelphia	Jan. 11	Beef	960,960
			Mutton	67,200
	New York	Jan. 14	Beef	3,960,320
			Mutton	1,064,000
			Various meats	8,960
Cap Verde, Dec. 12	Boston	Jan. 18	Beef	318,080
			Mutton	224,000
	Houston	Jan. 9	Beef	248,640
			Mutton	201,600
	Charleston	Jan. 15	Beef	147,840
	Norfolk	Jan. 16	do	67,200
			Mutton	67,200
	Boston	Jan. 18	Beef	107,520
			Mutton	56,000
	New York	Jan. 20	Beef	1,276,800
Wharanui, Dec. 11			Mutton	103,040
	Philadelphia	Jan. 24	Beef	235,200
			Mutton	100,800
	Charleston	Jan. 6	Beef	98,560
	Boston	Jan. 10	do	418,880
			Mutton	64,960
	Norfolk	Jan. 12	Beef	221,760
			Mutton	67,200
	Philadelphia	Jan. 15	Beef	152,320
			Mutton	38,080
Wharanui, Dec. 11	New York	Jan. 17	Beef	3,337,600
			Mutton	109,760
			Various meats	20,160

¹ Cities listed indicate location of purchaser and usually the port of arrival and general market area, but meat may be diverted to other areas for sale.
² To be transhipped.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 17, 1964]

THE CATTLE CRISIS—SHATTERED HOPES, WEATHERED FED BUNKS TELL SAD STORY—IF FARMER IS LUCKY, HE CAN BREAK EVEN (By Howard Silber and Darwin Olofson)

Don Foster is a burly, powerful, willing man of the soil.

He has farmed near Indianola, Nebr., for 17 years. He has worked hard. For the most part he has made a living.

But Don, who is 36 and the father of four, has yearned for something more than just a living. As a tenant farmer who rents the land he tills, he realized long ago that one way to achieve this modest ambition would be to increase the value of his share of the grain he raises.

This could be done by feeding it to cattle, processing the grain into beef.

Last year Don Foster became a cattle feeder. With bank loans, he purchased over a period of months about 200 head fresh from the range. Each weighed between 600 and 700 pounds. He paid an average of 26 cents a pound.

Using grains he raised and commercial feed supplements, Don built up the size and quality of his animals. When their weight approached 1,100 pounds he marketed them. He was paid between 20 and 21 cents a pound.

Don Foster was the victim of a severely depressed fat cattle market. He took an average loss of \$40 an animal. His cattle-feeding venture resulted in an \$8,000 deficit.

DON WILL TRY AGAIN

In an effort to make ends meet Don is working at the Urling Grain Elevator at Indianola.

"Sure I'm going to farm in the spring," he told the World-Herald, "and I'm going to feed cattle again—if I can borrow the money to buy the cattle and if it looks like the market will be right. I've got to feed again. It's the only way I can get even.

"I hope this year will be better. All I've got to show for 1963 are weathered feed bunks and the smell of the cattle that are gone."

Audubon County, Iowa, is some 300 miles east of Don Foster's place. It is a county of well-kept farms that roll over gentle hills. The county prides itself on the efficiency of its farmers, the excellence of its corn crops and the high quality of its transient livestock population—cattle on feed.

Last month, the Audubon Junior Chamber of Commerce named Darrell Jensen, 30, the county's outstanding young farmer of the year. A. A. Kruse, executive vice president of the First State Bank of Audubon, heartily indorse the selection.

"Darrell's a good farmer—hard working, smart, and full of fire. You can't keep him down," the banker declared.

Darrell fed 203 head of cattle in 1963. "I was lucky," he said. "I broke even, got all my bills paid. I guess I sold at the right time."

EFFICIENT, UNPROFITABLE

In the lush Imperial Valley of California the family farm is often a multimillion-dollar

by farmers and feeders at 12 principal markets—Omaha, Chicago, Cincinnati, Denver, Fort Worth, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Oklahoma City, St. Louis, Sioux City, Sioux Falls, and St. Joseph.

	1962	1963	1964
January:			
Steers.....	\$24.77	\$25.72	\$21.63
Heifers.....	24.10	24.94	21.02
February:			
Steers.....	24.85	23.82	
Heifers.....	23.96	23.09	
March:			
Steers.....	25.15	22.28	
Heifers.....	24.08	21.67	
April:			
Steers.....	25.49	22.55	
Heifers.....	24.44	22.02	
May:			
Steers.....	24.61	21.73	
Heifers.....	23.82	21.46	
June:			
Steers.....	24.21	22.03	
Heifers.....	23.52	21.75	
July:			
Steers.....	25.16	24.06	
Heifers.....	24.01	23.31	
August:			
Steers.....	26.77	24.01	
Heifers.....	25.15	23.24	
September:			
Steers.....	28.25	23.53	
Heifers.....	26.19	22.69	
October:			
Steers.....	27.88	23.35	
Heifers.....	26.15	22.34	
November:			
Steers.....	28.36	22.55	
Heifers.....	26.81	21.73	
December:			
Steers.....	27.40	21.25	
Heifers.....	26.23	20.48	

REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1057) to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Indigent Defendants Act of 1963".

SEC. 2. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding immediately after section 3006 the following new section:

"§ 3006A. Representation of indigent defendants

"(a) In every criminal case arising under laws of the United States in which the defendant appears without counsel, the United States commissioner or the court shall advise the defendant that he has the right to be represented by counsel and that counsel will be appointed or assigned to represent him if he is financially unable to obtain counsel. Unless the defendant waives the appointment or assignment of counsel, the United States commissioner or the court, if satisfied after appropriate inquiry that the defendant is financially unable to obtain counsel, shall appoint counsel to represent him or, in the alternative, shall assign a counsel who is made available by a bar association or legal aid society. The United States commissioner or the court shall appoint or assign separate counsel for defendants who have such conflicting interests that they cannot properly be represented by the same counsel, or when other good cause is shown. Counsel appointed by the United States commissioner or the court shall be selected from a panel of counsel designated or approved by the judge of each United States district court. No Member of Congress shall be appointed to serve as counsel in any case covered by this Act.

"(b) A defendant for whom counsel is appointed or assigned under this section shall be represented at every stage of the proceedings from his initial appearance before the United States commissioner or court, or from any subsequent stage at which counsel is appointed or assigned, through appeal. If at any time after the appointment or assignment of counsel the court having jurisdiction of the case is satisfied that the defendant is financially able to obtain counsel or to make partial payment for the representation, he may terminate the appointment or assignment of counsel or authorize payment as provided in subsection (e), as the interests of justice may dictate. If, at any time during the course of the criminal proceedings, including an appeal, the court having jurisdiction of the case finds that the defendant is financially unable to pay counsel whom he had retained, the court may appoint counsel as provided in subsection (a) and authorize payment as provided in subsection (e), as the interests of justice may dictate. The United States commissioner or the court may, in the interests of justice, substitute one appointed or assigned counsel for another at any stage of the proceedings.

"(c) An attorney appointed or the bar association or legal aid society which made an attorney available for assignment pursuant to this section shall at the conclusion of the representation or any segment thereof be compensated at a rate not exceeding \$15 per hour for time expended in court and \$10 per hour for time reasonably expended outside of court or before a United States commissioner, and shall be reimbursed for expenses reasonably incurred. A separate claim for compensation and reimbursement shall be made to the district court for representation before the United States commissioner or that court, and to each appellate court before which the attorney represented the defendant. Each claim shall be supported by an affidavit specifying the time expended, services rendered, and expenses incurred while the case was pending before the United States commissioner or court, and the compensation and reimbursement applied for or received in the same case from any other source. The court shall, in each instance, fix the compensation and reimbursement to be paid to the attorney: *Provided, however*, That the total compensation to be paid to the attorney for such representation shall not exceed \$500 in case of a felony and \$300 in case of a misdemeanor.

"(d) The court, in an ex parte proceeding, may authorize the appointed or assigned counsel to obtain investigative, expert, or other services necessary to an adequate defense to each defendant determined by the court to be financially unable to obtain them. The court which authorized the services shall direct the payment of reasonable compensation to the person who rendered the services: *Provided, however*, That such compensation shall not exceed \$500 per person in case of a felony and \$300 per person in case of a misdemeanor. A claim for compensation shall be supported by an affidavit specifying the time expended, services rendered, and expenses incurred on behalf of the defendant, and the compensation received in the same case for any other source.

"(e) Whenever the court is satisfied that funds are available for payment from or on behalf of a defendant, the court may authorize or direct that such funds be paid to appointed counsel, to an organization which made an attorney available for assignment, or to any person authorized pursuant to subsection (d) to assist in the representation. Except as so authorized or directed, no such person or organization may request or accept any payment or promise of payment for assisting in the representation of a defendant.

"(f) Each district court and judicial council of a circuit shall submit a report on the appointment or assignment of counsel within its jurisdiction to the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in such form and at such time as the Judicial Conference of the United States may specify.

"(g) There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States courts, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. When so specified in appropriation Acts, such appropriations shall remain available until expended. Payments from such appropriations shall be made under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

"(h) The term 'district court' as used in this section includes the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the District Court of Guam, and the district courts of the United States created by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code."

(b) The table of sections at the head of chapter 201 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding immediately after item 3006 the following:

"3006A. Representation of indigent defendants."

SEC. 3. Each district court and court of appeals shall commence compensation for appointed or assigned counsel within six months from the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. KEATING conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES OF WHEAT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived and that I may speak on another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is considering this week, in executive session, proposed new legislation for wheat and cotton. Programs are badly needed for both those commodities. I am hopeful that the Senate will take action at an early date to provide relief for the producers of those basic crops.

Any measure that we pass should contain a provision that the Commodity Credit Corporation be not permitted to sell Government-owned wheat for unrestricted use for less than 115 percent of the loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges.

This provision is contained in existing cotton legislation. With regard to wheat, however, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to make sales at 105 percent of the loan rate, plus the carrying charges.

Mr. President, it now appears likely that the carryover stocks of wheat on July 1, 1965, will be down to about 600 million bushels, or possibly even less. In other words, we shall then be at a level of minimum desirable carryover stocks or—to state the matter in another way—strategic food reserves. For some types of wheat, such as Soft Red Winter, our carryover stocks will be at the minimum by July 1, 1964.

As markets begin to respond to the demand for wheat and as the price to the farmer begins to rise, the Commodity Credit Corporation can establish a price ceiling by selling its Government-owned stocks at 105 percent of the loan rate. If there is no wheat legislation this year, the national average wheat loan this summer—and I emphasize the words "wheat loan"—would be about \$1.26. Under present Commodity Corporation sales authority, wheat prices would not rise above \$1.32, plus carrying charges, if Government sales continue to be made at the minimum authorized by law.

Mr. President, again I point out that the law sets the minimum, not the maximum.

By requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell at not less than 115 percent of the loan rate—which I recommend—the wheat farmer could receive from 10 cents a bushel to 15 cents a bushel more for his wheat. At the same time, the value of the inventory held by the Commodity Credit Corporation would increase. So, Mr. President, from both points of view, including the Government's investment in its own inventory of wheat stocks, a provision of 115 percent of the loan rate as the minimum sales price for the Commodity Credit Corporation would be desirable. To the farmer, it would be very desirable, because it would mean the market price would be affected in a beneficial manner by increasing that price by anywhere from 10 to 15 cents a bushel; also, the Government could realize a higher price for its wheat, due to strong world demand and the free market could operate to provide realistic differences between grades and types.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that so little attention is given in Congress to farm problems, many Members have almost lost interest in the facts relative to these complicated marketing arrangements. It is a fact that today the United States and Canada are practically the only major sources of export supplies of wheat. Why in the name of common sense our Government should sell the wheat out of the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory at a low price, when the world needs the wheat, is utterly beyond my comprehension.

Both Congress and the Department of Agriculture have responsibility in this connection. In fact, Congress set 105 percent of the loan rate as the minimum sales price for Commodity Credit Corporation wheat. So what we really are doing is giving the whole world a big bargain in connection with the wheat stocks owned by the Government of the United States, and paid for by the U.S. taxpayers, at a time when we could receive

a much fairer price for our wheat inventory. This situation is very similar to that in which a buyer is in great need and a seller—in this case, the United States—has the available supply. I cannot imagine that any businessman who found himself in a situation of having the available supplies almost totally under his control would, by his own action, deny himself a fair price from a world market that desperately needed those supplies.

We should not overlook the position of the small wheat grower in this situation, either. Nationally, 2 out of every 3 wheat growers harvest less than 15 acres; in many States, the proportion is 9 out of 10. Many of these growers of winter wheat will not be in a position to participate in a new program, because they already have planted more than their 3-year average, less 10 percent—the requirement for eligibility in proposed legislation. Therefore, these hundreds of thousands of growers will have to depend on the free market in 1964 for their income from wheat. No legislation which we could pass now, in terms of an overall wheat bill, could affect these hundreds of thousands of small wheat producers. The placing of a ceiling of 105 percent of the loan for these farmers will sharply reduce the wheat income of this substantial group, and also, I may say, will sharply reduce farm income.

Mr. President, less than 10 days ago the Senate passed the tax-reduction bill, the purpose of which is stimulation of the American economy—in other words, to place in the hands of consumers and investors more free capital, to be used by the consumers for the purchase of goods and services, and to be used by the investors for the purpose of expanding our industrial base. But if we do not watch out, we can seriously reduce the effectiveness of the tax bill which we recently passed, with much heralding of its beneficial effects on our economy, by having a sharp drop in farm income; and if there is a sharp drop in farm income, there will be a reduction in the effect of the tax-reduction bill on our economy and a further consolidation of American agriculture into larger and larger units, thus displacing thousands of farm families and sending them to overcrowded cities, where all too few jobs await those who are not skilled in industrial activities. The best market in America for development and the best potential purchasing power in America, if the farmer receives a fair price for the commodities he produces, is in rural America; and in rural America the effects of poverty are most visible and most obvious; and in rural America, with a slight increase in per capita income, there can be a very great increase in sales, which will result in marked improvement of the overall well-being of the American economy.

Mr. President, the recommendation I make today of a commodity credit minimum sales price of 115 percent of the loan rate on wheat—identical to the sales rate on cotton—is especially valid in view of the radically altered situation in the wheat economy of the world, a change which should fundamentally

affect the world wheat price level. I have commented on that subject previously. Just as after many months the world sugar price level reflected a new demand and supply situation, so the Communist wheat failures will be a significant market factor in the next few years. We should let that express itself in realistic free market prices. By July 1, 1964, the carryover stocks of wheat held by the four wheat-exporting nations will be the equivalent of only 2 months' requirements of the world.

I repeat, by July 1, 1964, the total carryover of wheat stocks in the world will be merely enough to provide for 2 months' consumption. In the kind of crazy world in which we live—a world that is plagued with disorder, revolution, and social unrest, a world in which we have no certainty of crop production, because crop production depends upon weather, and is even affected by pestilence and disease—2 months' supply of wheat stocks is skating on the thin edge of famine on a worldwide basis.

Therefore, it appears to me that all of those factors ought to be taken into consideration as we contemplate our agricultural policy.

The total supply will be only 1,500 million bushels. However, of that total it should not be overlooked that the stocks on that date in the Argentine and Australia will have been fully committed for export or for their own carryover needs for strategic reserve uses.

Argentina and Australia are the other two great wheat-producing countries, aside from Canada and the United States. Those two countries already will have committed their total supply. The Australians have established by national policy a national food reserve. Ours is the only nation that thinks we can eat bullets.

Every week I hear a report from the Department of Defense as to the amount of ammunition we need for reserves. Time after time it has been stated we must have a certain amount of ammunition for troops in Vietnam. We must have a certain amount of fuel oil for the Air Force in Europe. Repeatedly we are reminded by the Defense Department that we really have no defense, unless we have supplies available to carry us through several weeks of war or defense needs. Apparently someone has forgotten that troops must eat.

I never have been able to understand how a nation which has the responsibility for the defense of the free world, and which leads the whole free world in terms of defense commitments, can fail to write into law national security food reserves. We ought to have it clearly understood and known to friend and foe alike, and to the market—those who are wheat growers, in the grain business and in the food business—that our Government has available at all times a certain amount of food supplies that are set aside and maintained as a fresh supply of food and fiber for national security reserves.

It may be more important to have available food supplies than to have available atomic bombs. There is some hope that if there should be a war, a few

people would survive, and if there are to be survivors, they must eat. Food supplies would be a target of military attack as much as or more than cities or industries.

Very few of the great powers outside the Soviet Union, which because of its bungling and its collective farm setup has failure on its hands, have given serious attention to the problem of food supply.

Some governments have to give the subject attention because they are deficit food countries. They must import. But we, as an exporting country, surely should give the subject plenty of attention.

I have introduced proposed legislation to establish a National Food and Fiber Policy Commission to study our total agricultural policy and to update it, or at least make recommendations to the Congress, to the President and to the American people.

Much of our agricultural policy is outdated. It does not relate to the facts of 1964. I have introduced legislation to provide for the establishment of national security food and fiber reserves. As we cannot defend our country without such a policy, we are derelict in our responsibility if we merely rely upon good fortune for those reserves.

I have been commenting upon the need for strategic reserve uses. I pointed out the available world supply in 1964.

Of the Canadian estimated stocks of 450 million bushels, 175 million bushels, or a year's domestic needs, can reasonably be considered as a strategic Canadian need. Of the 800 million bushels estimated U.S. carryover, some 600 millions are considered essential for U.S. carryover needs.

Thus, of the estimated July 1, 1964, stocks of 1,500 million bushels, only about 500 million bushels are available for world export needs. This means that the world free reserves have been cut in half in 1 year, and by July 1, 1965, will have been cut in half again because the United States will have arrived at the minimum desirable level.

Mr. President, these facts are sufficient argument for lifting the Commodity Credit Corporation resale level to 115 percent of the loan rate.

I do not make the point that that is all that needs to be done. It would not be a fair statement. I am only saying that the resale level should be lifted to 115 percent. This is a more fair and reasonable resale price for Commodity Credit Corporation stocks than the present price of 105 percent of the loan rate.

Beginning with the 1964 marketing year would be a desirable time to let the farmers of the Nation obtain the full benefits of a less restrictive sales policy. The Commodity Credit Corporation and farmers need not be competitors for available markets. As one of the strong supporters of the Commodity Credit Corporation from its inception, I know it was designed to encourage orderly marketing by taking supplies off the market at harvest time. What is needed is to permit the free market price system through the commodity markets to really

operate and fulfill its essential economic function of moving wheat from the producer to the ultimate consumer at the least cost.

Many times I have found myself in some difference of opinion on agricultural policy with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and with some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. But I was much impressed with the statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] some weeks ago on the world wheat situation and pricing policy. He gave a constructive analysis of the situation that prevails in wheat production and marketing practice. I believe its purpose was to be helpful. While I do not believe it meets all the needs there are, it surely was a constructive and helpful message. I want to associate myself in part with it.

The Senator from Vermont has had wide experience. While he and I have on occasion disagreed on agricultural policy, I find myself more and more impressed with many of his arguments on the use of our food and fiber, how best to market it, and how best to manage our production. His views should be given careful consideration.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will promptly report to the Senate a bill relating to cotton and wheat. If we do not have legislation to help our cotton producers and our textile mills, there will be economic stagnation in the cotton market and the cotton processing areas of this country. We have a responsibility in the Congress to see that this does not happen. We are familiar with the dangers in the wheat production areas. I have introduced a wheat bill. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] introduced a bill. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] introduced a bill. So have others. We do not lay any claim to pride of authorship. What we are more interested in is legislation.

I conclude by most respectfully suggesting to my colleagues and to my able and distinguished friend who is the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and his associates in the Department, that the statement I have made today, to which I have given considerable thought and attention, be read with the objective of seeing whether it has something constructive to offer as to the price situation affecting agriculture.

I am hopeful there can be a meeting of minds on this subject. It will do no good to leave this session and go home saying we were not able to do anything for our farmers. American agriculture deserves more than that.

I am not interested in any partisan fights. I have been through those before. Too often agriculture has been the victim of many partisan battles. It is important to recognize the predicament we are in, and take whatever administrative steps are needed to alleviate the situation, and to act legislatively as soon as possible.

The President has sent a message on agriculture to the Congress. It was a good, constructive message. I plead that it be considered at the earliest possible time. Farm legislation cannot be passed

late in the year. It must be done as soon as possible. It is necessary that we get behind the President's proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a paper entitled "105 Percent versus 115 Percent Resale Price," which was prepared by Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 105-PERCENT VERSUS 115-PERCENT RESELL PRICE—THE PROS AND CONS OF A PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN SUPPORT AND RESELL PRICES OF WHEAT IN 1964 LEGISLATION

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, provided that in selling commodities for unrestricted use, the CCC price should be not less than 105 percent of the support price plus "reasonable carrying charges" (interest, storage).

2. In 1958, Congress provided, in the case of cotton, that the CCC sales price formula should be changed from 105 to 115 percent. There are a large number of proposals to make a similar change applicable to wheat in 1964 legislation.

3. The largest influence on the open market price of wheat at or immediately after harvest is the level of support prices available in the form of loans or purchase agreements to farmers. In subsequent months, the market price is influenced increasingly by the CCC selling price formula, usually called the "resale price." This price is published monthly by CCC covering sales from its inventories for unrestricted use.

4. The loan price at harvesttime provides the major alternative to sale for cash at the current market price by producers. Thus, the loan serves the function of a "floor" price for wheat. So also, the CCC resale price becomes the "ceiling" price because buyers of wheat will not pay more than the price at which at a given time they can buy it from CCC.

5. The range between the "floor" and the "ceiling" prices, as described above, has been narrowed by reduction in the CCC markup to reflect carrying charges in recent years.

Earlier, CCC sold at 105 percent of the support price during July, the first month of the wheat marketing year, then added 2 cents per month to its price to cover interest and storage costs to CCC for a total of 9 months ending April 30. It added no carrying charges for May and June—then reset its price at 105 percent of the applicable support July 1.

The carrying charge of 2 cents per month was halved. (There were, as always, variations reflecting grade, class, location, billing, etc. Loading-out charges averaging three-fourths of a cent were added to offset any such cost if incurred by CCC in connection with the sale and, as in the case of "in" charges, can, for purposes of this discussion, be disregarded in examining the changes in the formula price.)

Thus, CCC's resale price was reduced well below the cost experience of grain firms and well below customary trade practice.

6. CCC operations are required, under the charter enacted by Congress in 1948-49, to employ the usual and customary channels of trade and commerce. Unless restraint is exercised, in view of its great and growing power, its vast money resources, its nonneed to subject its operations to profit-and-loss criteria, CCC can dominate wheat prices, wheat supplies, sales, movements—in short, all wheat commerce of a significant character. To do so is neither contemplated, required, nor encouraged by Congress under

the laws so far enacted, but it is probably necessary for Congress to restate its position from time to time.

II. ADVANTAGES OF THE 115-PERCENT PROVISIO

1. Recently in arguing the advantages of certain measures intended to reduce CCC inventory, USDA estimated the cost of carrying a bushel of wheat as averaging 26.21 cents per year. This was made up of 13.53 cents for storage and handling, an average of 3.93 cents for transportation, an average cost incident to resale of 1.24 cents per bushel, and interest computed at its estimated cost to CCC of 7.51 cents per bushel.

Such estimates compared with the value judgments expressed in the advance in price to reflect carrying charges at a maximum of 9 cents per bushel over a 12-month period indicates a major contradiction. Furthermore, it indicates that CCC has traveled far indeed from the patterns employed in the usual and customary channels of trade in figuring carrying charges.

This contradiction also illustrates that mandates from Congress can turn and twist in unfathomable ways within a few years; that the current practice with respect to carrying charges are unrealistic, illogical, and in violation of CCC charter provisions.

This situation requires correction without regard to determination of the merits of 105 percent versus 115 percent.

2. If Congress desires to encourage the grain-marketing industry to exercise initiative and enterprise, it must reexamine the condition and durability of the rules Congress established to prevent unfair competition by CCC.

3. The 105- versus 115-percent issue, for purposes of objective examination of advantages and disadvantages, should be analyzed without regard to the specific level of support. In the case of various proposals for legislation for wheat presently under consideration, there is a considerable variation in the proposed levels of support.

The issue should be examined, first of all, in terms of its effects on stimulating private trade efforts in the marketplace.

4. If the considered views of the grain-marketing industry were requested, it may be remarked parenthetically that in excess of 95 to 99 percent of the leaders would be found to view CCC's present role as needlessly large and as in a state of aggressive growth.

An example: CCC requested the grain marketing industry to expand grain storage space for a number of years. Rates were gradually increased on a number of occasions. Warehousemen were offered other incentives to expand facilities. The result has been an increase in commercial grain storage facilities from about 1.25 billion bushels in 1950 to 5,453,240,000 bushels as of January 1, 1964. The latter figure is at least two to three times the normal needs.

In addition, CCC owns bins and other storage facilities with a capacity presently rated at 965 million bushels and has no program for reducing or disposing of these facilities which were originally brought into being with assurances to the grain marketing industry that they were for "standby and emergency use."

It is axiomatic that one Secretary of Agriculture, even within the same administration, is not bound by the pleadings or promises of his predecessors. Thus, the present Secretary, unless continuity of policy in fairness to the marketing industry is insisted upon by Congress, may proceed as he desires in a number of areas with results which can be most serious to the grain marketing industry.

To illustrate:

(a) He may favor the use of CCC-owned storage over commercial space, despite the language of the CCC charter. The CCC-owned storage facilities pay no taxes to school

districts, townships, counties, States, or the Federal Government; they are not essential to provide storage service at present except in a very few localities; they are expensive to maintain and administer because they do not justify the cost of modern equipment for large, efficient bulk handling of grain.

(b) He may, as he has only recently intimated, place grain storage rates on a competitive bid or other basis which would destroy the public utility principle of equal treatment for all farmers and other depositors. The bid system could result in curtailing operation of the higher cost structures in areas with the highest operating costs. It would provide a very great advantage to the lowest cost but least serviceable storages from the long-range standpoint of providing farmers an efficient marketing system—such as sheephead-type storage and similar facilities, including remodeled military barracks, abandoned railroad roundhouses, etc.

(c) Unless restrained, he could exercise unchallenged authority to cut existing carrying charges even further than they have been cut. He might, for example, reduce to zero the incentive of grain firms to build inventory for resale or for millers to acquire stocks from CCC at prices largely dictated by CCC's resale policies and practices.

5. The 115-percent resale minimum would reduce program costs because it would have the effect of increasing the volume of purchases to meet their requirements by millers and other end-users during harvest and through the redemption of loans by farmers. This would reduce the takeover volume of CCC.

Each bushel of grain which passes into the hands of CCC involves a considerable cost and a substantial loss, especially during the period of declining prices which are now in prospect.

For example, the reduction in the value of CCC inventory, assuming it will be about 1 billion bushels as of July 1, in case the support price is reduced from that in effect last year to \$1.30 or so, national average, next July 1 is obviously a very substantial sum.

6. The following illustrates the basis for computing the CCC resale price under 105 and 115 percent provisions in case the national average wheat loan level should be \$1.30 as of the marketing year beginning next July 1:

(a) The resale price for CCC stocks of wheat acquired under past programs for July of this year would be \$1.30 times 105 percent, or \$1.365. On August 1, 1 cent would be added and 1 cent per month thereafter for 8 additional months. The resale price would reach its maximum of \$1.455 in April 1965, remaining at that level until adjusted for the new marketing year starting July 1, 1965, in accord with the law then in effect.

(b) Should the 115 percent provision be in effect, the resale price for July 1964 would be \$1.30 times 115 percent, or \$1.495. By April 1965, the addition of an unrealistic "loss-leader" carrying charge of only 1 cent per month would bring the resale price for April, May, and June of 1965 to \$1.585.

7. The 115 percent formula would help insure that the United States would not have to place an embargo on wheat exported to comply with the minimum price under the international wheat agreement, pursuant to the Nation's commitment under that agreement.

The July 1964 price, under a \$1.30 loan level and the 105 percent proviso, would place the United States in a position where it would be offering wheat into export channels below the minimum price as related to the schedule setup under IWA, unless some unusual action was taken by the U.S. Government to insure meeting the IWA commitment.

Authority to deal with this matter was delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture by

the late President Kennedy soon after farmers voted to reject wheat marketing quotas in the referendum conducted in May 1963.

8. There are other reasons to support the 115 percent proviso, chiefly centering on lower costs to the CCC, encouraging the use of the marketing system, and reducing the prospect of cycling of CCC stocks. This is the process whereby CCC takes possession of stocks acquired under price support with one outstretched hand while, with its other long hand, it sells out inventory which it has possessed for 1, 2, or 3 years. Where CCC owns the commodity outright, this should be known as the stalling period.

For demand to be met out of current production by farmers: Assists in reducing CCC costs; it reduces the cycling of stocks; it contributes to more aggressive marketing activity on the part of the grain marketing industry to meet domestic and export needs.

III. THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE 115-PERCENT PROVISIO

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has, at present, authority to increase support and resale prices. The principal argument in opposition to writing into law a provision requiring a minimum resale price of 115 percent of the support price or the market price, whichever is higher, is that such authority resides in the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time and that he would exercise it if need be.

It is argued that public confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture on the part of farmers and the wheat marketing industry, on the part of Members of Congress of both parties, and on the part of the public generally, is extremely high; that he should be entrusted with the broadest possible delegation of authority by Congress in such matters as the CCC resale price.

Furthermore, Congress should, it is argued, leave to his judgment and discretion such matters so as to insure that "a non-political, scientific, and enlightened policy and program would be pursued devoid of congressional controversy" which such program specifics as the 115-percent proposal might engender; that it is assumed he would seek the guidance of the marketing industry, of farm organizations, and of farmers themselves to guide his decisionmaking.

2. The decisions he would make, because they would not be announced in advance, could well keep competitors of the United States in the world wheat trade guessing long and hard; that this tactic would be in the best tradition of Yankee trading and would immeasurably increase the bargaining power of the United States in international wheat markets because of his experience and proved skill in such matters.

3. By delegating the broadest possible powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, Congress will be arming him and his successors with the tools and authority to exercise his demonstrated skills in public management, in achieving efficiency and economy, in inventory management, in reducing operating costs of the Department of Agriculture, and related matters.

4. It may well be that the Secretary, after studying the matter, may decide that resale of wheat should be at 120 percent or a higher percentage of the support level. For Congress to have specified a minimum of 115 percent might, in such event, appear to be inhibiting the making of a decision to specify a higher resale price.

5. It is also argued that the utility of merchandising efforts, domestic and export, of the grain marketing industry have been greatly overvalued and overstated; that the farmers' interest would be better served by enlarging the role of Government in acquiring stocks and disposing of them; and that leaving the matter to the determination of the Secretary would facilitate this development.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is the Senate still operating under the rule of germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator may request that he be recognized to address himself to another subject.

Mr. McNAMARA. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes on two separate items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, was the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, but Lithuanians, in America or in the Republic of Lithuania, are not celebrating this date as a holiday—for the Soviets have violated their sovereignty and made a mockery of freedom.

Since June of 1940, Lithuania has been cruelly oppressed by the military occupation forces of Soviet Russia. Through extermination and deportation, this courageous nation has lost more than one-fourth of its entire population. At least 20 percent of the present inhabitants are Soviet colonists. Almost one-third of all Lithuanians live abroad. Over a million have chosen America as their refuge.

When one considers that those who were murdered and deported have been the strongest elements of the country, this population loss would strike a fatal blow at the chance of survival of the Lithuanian nation if it were not for the courage and sacrifice of its patriots.

Mr. President, I share the hopes of millions of persons of Baltic origin that the day will come when the brave people of Lithuania free themselves from the Soviet tyranny that now oppresses them and that they once again enjoy the state of national independence they so strongly desire.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S EXECUTIVE ORDER AGAINST AGE DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, last Thursday, President Johnson issued an Executive order prohibiting Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of age in the hiring of employees.

As one who has long been concerned with this problem, and who has attempted to solve it at the legislative level, I wish to commend the President for taking this important, and long-needed step.

The President's order prohibits Federal contractors and subcontractors from setting maximum age limits for most jobs. The few exceptions are largely of a technical nature.

In effect, the President's order applies to the growing number of workers—45 and over—who have been the principal victims of this employment bias, based on age.

This emerging pattern of age bias has been a matter of concern for several

years to the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and to its predecessor, the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, both of which I have had the honor of serving as chairman.

These Senate study units found that jobseekers as young as 45 were denied employment, even though they were fully qualified in all respects, on the sole basis of age.

As a direct outgrowth of these findings, I introduced legislation in the 86th and 87th Congresses designed to forbid age discrimination by Federal contractors and subcontractors.

The goal of these bills was identical to that of the Executive order issued last week by President Johnson.

That President Johnson has accomplished this goal by Executive action is a source of great satisfaction to me.

I sincerely hope that all employers affected by the order will cooperate fully in achieving its worthwhile purpose.

It is my further hope that employers, labor organizations, and local and State governments not covered by the order will take note of this Presidential action and follow the example set here, to eliminate one more barrier to realizing the American tradition of equal opportunity for men and women who are willing and able to work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 847, Senate bill 178, and temporarily lay aside the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 178), to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, is this the authorization bill for the Garrison project?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct. It would amend the authorization.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the amount of the authorization?

Mr. BURDICK. In money?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. The construction money for a period of up to 25 years is \$212 million under the present bill.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the total cost?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; over the construction period.

Mr. CURTIS. Roughly, how is that divided between flood control allocations, irrigation allocations, fish and wildlife, and so on?

Mr. BURDICK. Municipal industrial water, \$11 million; irrigation, \$191 million; fish and wildlife, \$30 million; recreation \$12 million; and flood control \$2,800,000. These are round numbers, of course.

Mr. CURTIS. The irrigation allocation is \$191 million?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. What portion of it will be repaid by the landowners?

Mr. BURDICK. The landowners will pay approximately 13 to 14 percent. The balance will be paid from power revenues.

Mr. CURTIS. With reference to the power revenues, has the committee received the power report on rates from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. BURDICK. I believe they have.

Mr. CURTIS. This information, then—

Mr. BURDICK. There has not been any specific action either by our committee or the House committee on the power formula yet, but I understand it will be reached in due time.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the bill correspond to the provisions set forth in the power revenue?

Mr. BURDICK. In the power payout which is proposed by the Secretary of the Interior an increase in rates in the Missouri River Basin and also for a change in the interest rate.

Mr. CURTIS. Will those changes require legislation?

Mr. BURDICK. I believe the interest rate may require legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. The interest rate would be changed from what to what; does the Senator know?

Mr. BURDICK. It would be changed to 2½ percent for the basic rate for the corps projects on river systems to make it compatible and consistent with the river systems; such things as the Columbia, and others.

Mr. CURTIS. But the hearings on the Garrison diversion unit were held prior to receipt of the power payoff?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Hearings in the House are being held this week. It is anticipated that perhaps whatever impact the power report may have may be reflected in the House amendments?

Mr. BURDICK. That is what I anticipate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I notice that \$191 million of the \$248 million project is for irrigation; is that correct?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What would be the benefits of the irrigation, if any, in terms of crop production?

Mr. BURDICK. In order to construct the dams and the reservoirs, it has required 568,000 acres which have already been taken out of production in North Dakota to make room for the reservoir system. The original authorization, which we are amending today, would call for an irrigation project embracing a million acres. In other words, at the time of the 1944 Flood Control Act, we lost this land to main stem reservoir system and in return would receive a million acres back in irrigation. This amendment reduces that figure to 250,000 acres, or less than half the acreage that has been taken out for reservoir purposes.

The actual change in farming operations will result in a shift from surplus crops, such as wheat, to nonsurplus crops such as feed grains and alfalfa, and things of that nature, and bringing in a supplemental economy based on livestock. But there is no new land being brought into production. As a matter of fact, all the lands embraced by this project are already in production and would be shifted from present production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How much of this production will be in feed grains? It is a price support program, which, of course, the Senator from North Dakota knows much better than I.

Mr. BURDICK. I was thinking of crops like alfalfa and others of that kind used in beef production and meat production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Has any comparison been made as to the difference in the value of the crops produced?

Mr. BURDICK. The answer to that question is in the report, if the Senator cares to have the answer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do.

Mr. BURDICK. On page 3 of the report it is stated:

About 75 percent of the irrigated acreage should be used for forage crops and feed for livestock production.

Therefore, for at least 75 percent of it, there would not be a cash crop.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The land that has been taken out of production, is out for all time.

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Whether the bill is passed or not, that is something that has been accomplished. Is that correct?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. In 1944, we took out 568,000 acres. This irrigation project was approved as a part of the consideration for the reduction of the acreage. This was a part of the 1944 package. This has already been authorized. All that this amendment would do would be to provide an authorization for reducing the irrigation part to 250,000 acres over a period of 25 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is the Senator saying, then, that if this authorization bill is not passed, more land will come into production?

Mr. BURDICK. It is argued that we already have an authorization for a million acres.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then we do not need further authorization, do we?

Mr. BURDICK. Except that in cases of this kind Congress always likes to take another look at project authorizations, when they are as old as this one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I approve of that policy. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.5 to 1. If we disregard the benefits which would flow from an increase in the agricultural surplus, is there any way of calculating the ratio so that the benefit ratio would be unity? The cost of the project, as I understand, is \$248 million.

Mr. BURDICK. It is \$212 million, because the difference has already been assigned as a part of the reservoir cost.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. The cost ratio is 2.5 to 1. The benefit would have to be in the neighborhood of \$700 million. I wonder what the value of the crops produced would be, so that I may calculate whether, if we disregard what I would disregard—because we already have a surplus of all crops—this would be a unity ratio or less.

Mr. BURDICK. I regret that I do not have that computation, but I think it would be because under irrigation the cropping pattern is changed and there are other project benefits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 178.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "acres", to insert "municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control"; in line 6, after "1962", to insert "(Revised May 1963)"; after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 2. In connection with the carrying out of the plan for the Garrison diversion unit, the Secretary is authorized to make provision for the conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources of the area in accordance with the authorities and procedures of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (38 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661, et seq.): *Provided*, That no land for the conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources of the area shall be acquired with funds authorized to be made available pursuant to this Act unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District or the Oahe Conservancy Sub District in their respective States.

The Secretary is authorized to construct recreational facilities essentially as described in aforesaid House Document Numbered 325, and to withdraw or acquire by such means as he considers in the public interest, additional lands required therefor if the State of North Dakota, or a political subdivision thereof, or a public entity agrees to operate and maintain such recreational facilities for a period of at least twenty years. After twenty years of State or local operation and maintenance, the Secretary is authorized to convey to the State, or to a political subdivision thereof, or to a public entity, without monetary consideration, the recreation facilities, including land therefor, to be used, operated, and maintained by the State, or political subdivision, or public entity exclusively for public park, recreation, and con-

servations purposes. Except for works and areas which will be administered by an agency of the Department of the Interior, provision of specific facilities for these purposes shall not be undertaken by the Secretary until suitable agreements have been made with State or local agencies respecting, among other things, administration and the bearing or sharing of appropriate operation and maintenance costs. Appropriate shares of the Federal costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Garrison diversion unit shall be allocated to the purposes specified in this section and shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable as are certain other purposes of the project under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto).

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, as a part of the Garrison diversion unit, to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities, including access roads, to acquire or withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the unit; these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State, or local public agencies, or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertaking described in this paragraph, including the costs of investigation, planning, operation, and maintenance, and an appropriate share of the joint cost of the Garrison diversion unit shall be nonreimbursable.

On page 4, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the existence of any reservation of right-of-way for canals under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391; 43 U.S.C. 945), the Secretary is authorized to pay just compensation to the owners of private lands west of the one hundredth meridian, for all lands or interest in lands required for right-of-way purposes for the Garrison diversion unit.

On page 5, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "4" to "3"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "5" to "4"; in line 14, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "project" and insert "unit", and at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "6" to "5"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the general plan for the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as modified by the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained in House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, is confirmed and approved under the designation "Garrison diversion unit," and the construction of a development providing for the irrigation of two hundred and fifty thousand acres municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control and other project purposes shall be

prosecuted by the Department of the Interior substantially in accordance with the plans set out in the Bureau of Reclamation report dated November 1962 (revised May 1963) supplemental report to said House Document 325.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized, as a part of the Garrison diversion unit, to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities, including access roads, to acquire or withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the unit; these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State, or local public agencies, or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertaking described in this paragraph, including the costs of investigation, planning, operation, and maintenance, and an appropriate share of the joint cost of the Garrison diversion unit shall be nonreimbursable.

Sec. 3. The Garrison diversion unit shall be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary shall give consideration to returning to the Missouri River to the fullest extent practicable such of the return flows as are not required for beneficial purposes.

Sec. 4. The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the unit shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I did not have notice that the pending bill would be considered at this time. At the present time we are considering important wheat legislation in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in fact an amendment of mine is now pending. I am very pleased, though that this bill is being brought up at this time and I feel sure it can be disposed of in a very short while.

The legislation the Senate is now considering is very important to North Da-

kota and to the Nation. I should like to make a brief statement with reference to this bill.

What we have before us in S. 178 is reauthorizing legislation with respect to the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota, which has already been authorized under the Pick Sloan plan of 1944.

Because of a change in the point of diversion, a shift in the area within North Dakota to be irrigated, and because of the years that have elapsed, it was considered best to reauthorize the project now.

This bill will mean a great deal in our efforts to stabilize the economy of North Dakota. The population of North Dakota is approximately the same as it was 30 years ago. Many of our people had to leave because of lack of opportunity, the increasing size of farms, and a prolonged period of drought.

The project would go a long way toward stabilizing not only our agriculture but the whole economy of North Dakota.

It would produce, for example, alfalfa and other feed crops, and encourage smaller farm operations, as well as provide opportunity for all our people. It would also furnish water to the cities in the eastern part of North Dakota, such as our two largest cities, Grand Forks and Fargo, which in drought years have faced serious water problems. In the drought years, they had a very difficult time in providing water to their then much smaller populations. The project under consideration would provide the needed additional water which these cities need, and which other cities in North Dakota also need.

It is sometimes argued that this is not the time to engage in further reclamation projects, because we already have big surpluses. Mr. President, if we had waited to start new reclamation projects until there were no surplus in crops we would never have had any irrigation projects initiated anywhere in the United States. There never was a time when there was not a surplus of food in the United States. I hope there always will be. However, the only way we can assure an adequate food supply for the future is through projects such as this. In any event, the bill itself provides that no crop in surplus can be produced under irrigation for 10 years from the date of its enactment.

Irrigation projects are largely responsible for the great empire that we have built in the western part of the United States. The proposed project will do as much for the State of North Dakota, I believe, and for the whole Nation.

Finally, I should like to make one more point. North Dakota is the No. 1 duck propagation State. This project, with its wildlife features, will do a great deal toward helping in duck propagation, as well as in the propagation of other wildlife and fish. It is of great interest to outdoorsmen and to sportsmen all over the United States.

Under the Pick-Sloan plan, North Dakota now has the Garrison Dam which is a multipurpose dam.

The multipurpose features include benefits from flood control, power generation, reclamation, and even some nav-

igation. North Dakota lost approximately 500,000 acres of its best agricultural land in the areas flooded by both the Garrison Dam in North Dakota and by the Oahe Dam in South Dakota, which backs water up into North Dakota.

For these and many other reasons, I am hopeful that the Senate will favorably consider the bill and will pass it promptly. This is an irrigation project we in North Dakota have been striving for for nearly a half a century. It is an excellent project with a highly favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. It would be of great benefit not only to North Dakota but to the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I made before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on June 6 last.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG OF NORTH DAKOTA

Senate bill 178, sponsored by Senator BURDICK and myself of North Dakota, and Senators MUNDT and MCGOVERN of South Dakota, is the most important piece of legislation affecting my State to be considered by Congress for a long, long time. North Dakota has, for almost 75 years, diligently sought a means to divert water from the Missouri River to central and eastern North Dakota. Although many proposals were advanced in the first half century of this effort, it was the authorization of the Missouri River Basin project by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 that gave the needed impetus to the proposal.

The interest and support of North Dakota for a Missouri River Diversion project was greatly intensified during the drought period of the 1930's when the importance of water was so dramatically emphasized. The Red River of the north, at that time supplying water for two of North Dakota's largest cities as well as two important cities on the Minnesota side, had practically dried up. During much of the 1930's, and many times since, we have had severe drought periods that had a tremendous adverse effect on all of our agriculture. You can better realize the importance of water and irrigation to North Dakota when you consider that we have often had years of marginal rainfall and this, when agriculture represents more than 80 percent of all the income. Irrigation is badly needed in North Dakota to stabilize our farm and other income.

The Bureau of Reclamation investigations of the diversion project have resulted in certain recommended modifications to the original authorization of diversion from the Missouri River in the Flood Control Act of 1944. I wish to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this project has been authorized and all we are seeking is the modifications proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation recommends modifications to the plan originally proposed insofar as the point of diversion and the location of lands to be served are concerned. These investigations have also determined that the project is engineeringly sound and economically feasible. Today we are asking for your approval of the changes to the originally authorized Missouri River diversion project in North Dakota, now designated the Garrison diversion unit, so that we can proceed with its development. By approving the new modified plan you will contribute immeasurably to the economic health of North Dakota, as well as to the upper Great Plains region and the Nation as a whole.

The Missouri River Basin project, as it evolved and was authorized by Congress in 1944, recognized the needs of all the basin as well as the contributions each of the States would, or could, make to the project and the economy of the Nation. Beneficial use of water for irrigation and municipal and industrial purposes in the upper basin States was an integral part of the plan and represented their primary interest, just as flood control and navigation represented the principal interest of the lower basin States. To accomplish these objectives it was also recognized that large upstream main stem dams and reservoirs would be required to control and store floodwaters. There was no alternative but to flood millions of acres of valuable river bottom land in the upper basin States for these reservoirs. In North Dakota over 550,000 acres were acquired for the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs.

It was our understanding from the start that this great loss in acreage would be partially offset by irrigation that was possible through development of the Garrison diversion unit. When the Senate Appropriations Committee was considering funds to start the construction of Garrison Dam, I told the committee, and this appears in the hearings of the committee, that if North Dakota did not one day attain a sizable irrigation project Garrison Dam and Reservoir itself would be a net loss to North Dakota. We were willing to make this sacrifice, but always with the understanding that the Pick-Sloan promise of irrigation was equally important as the other benefits to be accrued from the Missouri River Basin program such as flood control, hydroelectric power, and navigation.

By far, the greater part of the major benefits accruing from the Garrison Dam to date, which include flood control, navigation, and power benefits, accrue to areas outside of North Dakota. Irrigation development in the upper basin, North Dakota's principal interest, has not kept pace with other project functions. Approval of S. 178, which will authorize an initial 250,000-acre phase of the potential million acre Garrison diversion unit, will pave the way to correct this situation.

The multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit will serve a number of important needs. In addition to providing water for irrigation and municipal and industrial uses, new recreation opportunities will be available, and fish and wildlife resources will be enhanced. The project costs allocated to each function appear to be reasonable, particularly when compared to the extensive benefits that will be derived from each of the important services from the project. Over 80 percent of the total investment required for the Garrison diversion unit is reimbursable and will be repaid to the Federal Treasury by the water users, the Garrison diversion conservancy district, and surplus Missouri Basin power revenues. The 250,000-acre initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit has a very favorable 2.51 to 1 benefit-cost ratio as reported by the Secretary of Interior in its official report to your committee.

The citizens of North Dakota are solidly behind the Garrison Diversion Unit. Virtually every statewide organization in North Dakota, including farm, civic, and conservation organizations as well as the Greater North Dakota Association, counties, municipalities, chambers of commerce and other local farm and civic groups, have endorsed and support the project.

The North Dakota Legislature created the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District which now includes 25 counties in the State to further the project. This district has the authority to contract for certain aspects of the project and finance these contracts through a general tax levy that will be spread over all property in the counties in the district. The ability to tax indirect

beneficiaries to the extent contemplated through the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District is a unique feature of this district.

The farmers who own irrigable land have voluntarily organized 8 irrigation districts in the Garrison Diversion Unit area. These districts and the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District have substantially agreed to contracts that will be negotiated with the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction and operation of the project.

Although the legislation before this committee will authorize only one-fourth of the originally proposed project, I very strongly urge its enactment. We ask only for our fair share of the benefits from the overall Missouri River Basin project, and the opportunity for our State to make its full contribution to the growth and strength of our Nation.

I earnestly hope that this committee will take favorable action on S. 178.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the report on the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 870) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

Enactment of S. 178 would provide for necessary modifications in the Missouri River Basin project authorizations to accommodate the special conditions of the Garrison diversion unit. The principal revision would be to reduce the irrigated acreage from the original proposed 1,007,000 acres to 250,000 acres, with the corresponding decrease in costs.

NEED

This project will be of increasing importance to the future growth, economy, and well-being, not only of the area directly affected, but of the entire State of North Dakota. The economy of the State was adversely affected when it lost 548,000 acres, mostly farmland, flooded by the Missouri River Basin reservoirs. The irrigation of the 250,000 acres proposed under the Garrison unit will go a long way in offsetting the loss of land that has been flooded.

North Dakota, like the other Great Plains States, is on the borderline between the humid and the arid areas of the Nation. Some years there is plenty of rainfall for a large portion of the State, but in a good many years the precipitation is entirely inadequate. During those dry years or years of short supply the farmers who are dependent solely upon rainfall for the moisture requirements of their crops suffer serious and extreme losses. The proposed irrigation would supplement the rainfall and would give assurance of a full crop year in and year out.

The development of the project would actually result in a reduction of agricultural surpluses. Most of the land to be irrigated is now growing wheat, but when irrigation water is provided the rules of irrigation economics will dictate that wheat acres be displaced by feed-crop acres on the farms of the unit.

About 75 percent of the irrigated acreage should be used for forage crops and feed for livestock production—items which are not in surplus, and for which demand is increasing faster than for other agricultural products.

Because of today's surpluses of wheat and corn grain, on the one hand, and the rising population growth rate, on the other, the proposed time schedule for development of irrigation on these lands was carefully considered. The testified schedule of irrigation development for the Garrison diversion unit provides for only 20 percent of ultimate development by 1980.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

The plan of development for the initial stage provides for irrigation of 250,000 acres, a municipal and industrial water supply for 15 towns and cities, 24 areas for fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation development at 7 major water impoundments. Flood control and incidental drainage of nonirrigable lands are other benefits.

Six areas make up the 250,000 acres. They constitute a feasible development, but other areas could also be used in the event any should drop out of the initial development. The system includes 1,932 miles of canals and laterals, 4 regulating reservoirs, 156 pumping plants, and about 2,265 miles of drains to control ground and surface water. Pumping power will be supplied by either existing or proposed federally constructed facilities, or by wheeling over electric cooperative or utility lines.

The facilities to serve the modified plan will be constructed during a period of about 11 years to full initial size, with first delivery water for irrigation during the fifth year of construction. Construction of deferred drains is expected to continue for another 20 years.

PROJECT LANDS

About 30 percent of the gross area surveyed and classified is irrigable. Almost without exception the topsoil of the irrigable land is a dark-colored, open, permeable material that is high in organic material and free from harmful accumulations of salt or alkali. All irrigable land is of good quality, capable of producing a variety of irrigated crops over a long period of time. Nearly 50 percent of the irrigable land included in the 250,000-acre development has been fully investigated and delineated by a detailed land classification survey.

WATER SUPPLY

Water supply for the unit will be diverted from Garrison Reservoir, constructed by the Corps of Engineers on the Missouri River. Estimated annual diversion from Garrison Reservoir for the 250,000 acres is about 805,000 acre-feet.

Cost

Project cost.....	\$248,234,000
Irrigation.....	191,132,000
Repaid by irrigator and conservancy district.....	25,546,000
Repaid by power.....	165,586,000
Municipal and industrial water.....	11,285,000
Power.....	37,000
Fish and wildlife (nonreimbursable).....	30,845,000
Recreation (nonreimbursable).....	12,122,000
Flood control.....	2,813,000
Total.....	248,234,000
Construction cost of Garrison unit.....	212,383,000
Assigned cost, Garrison Reservoir.....	17,768,000
Assigned cost, pumping power.....	18,083,000
Total.....	248,234,000

NOTE.—Benefit-cost ratio, 2.5 to 1.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Flood Control Act of 1944 provided for a comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin. In the interests of the overall program in several States, North Dakota sacrificed 568,000 acres of good farm and ranch land for Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs.

As partial compensation for this sacrifice, North Dakota was to benefit from

an irrigation development which it has not yet received. Flood control, pollution abatement, navigation, municipal and industrial water supplies, and power benefits have accrued principally to areas outside North Dakota.

North Dakota to date has sustained a net loss because of the Missouri River Basin project in the permanent loss of the land and the wealth produced on it.

The negative impact of the loss to North Dakota in land resources has been emphatically set forth in a study conducted by the North Dakota State University titled "Negative Impacts of the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs on the North Dakota Economy." Facts pointed out in this study indicate the following: First, based on the potential land use of the areas acquired, the direct loss to the North Dakota economy totals \$15.7 million annually because of these main stem reservoirs; second, the indirect loss related to the severance of the bottom lands from the uplands amounts to \$2.7 million each year; third, the net annual loss to wildlife habitat is estimated at \$216,000; fourth, the value of timber resources lost through reservoir inundation is estimated at \$38,649,000; fifth, approximately 217,000 acres of irrigable land are inundated by the reservoirs or subjected to erosion; therefore, the increased contribution that irrigation development of these acres could have made to the economy of North Dakota has been forever destroyed; and sixth, an estimated 5,850 million tons of lignite coal was left in the land inundated by these reservoirs.

Engineering investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation since 1944 have determined the necessity of shifting the location of the lands to be irrigated from the northwestern part of North Dakota eastward. The Bureau recommended a start on an initial 250,000-acre phase of the originally contemplated 1-million-acre project. Included in the project are provisions for municipal and industrial water supply, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement, flood control, and lake restoration.

Because of the engineering investigations, a modified authorization was required. The modification is accomplished by S. 178, which I introduced, with my colleagues, MILTON YOUNG, GEORGE MCGOVERN, and KARL MUNDT, as cosponsors.

In short, the plan for the Garrison diversion unit is a modern and modified version of the original proposal for irrigation development in North Dakota.

Mr. President, limited and erratic rainfall severely restricts the opportunity of North Dakota farmers to diversify their operations. The 250,000 irrigated acres will be integrated with up to 1 million acres of adjacent dry land, bringing stability and balance to agriculture in the area and eliminating the constant threat of drought.

I wish to emphasize that the Garrison diversion unit will reduce the acreage devoted to wheat and other small grains which, as we know, are in chronic surplus. An estimate by the North Dakota State University indicates that 85,000 acres currently devoted to the production of wheat and other small grains

will be diverted to crops required for livestock.

In this connection, it should be noted that the Nation's requirements for meat are increasing and are expected to increase further with population growth.

Even the 250,000-acre phase of the irrigation development will require 25 years to complete; by that time, the population is expected to be 120 million greater than it presently is.

In the Garrison diversion unit, we are not reclaiming desert land; all of the land that is to be irrigated is now in agricultural production.

The net effect of the project will be to reduce the production of surplus crops. In fact, written into S. 178 is a prohibition against the raising of surplus crops for a period of 10 years from the date of authorization.

Extensive studies by the Bureau of Reclamation over a 20-year period indicate that the Garrison Diversion Unit is sound and feasible and will produce \$2.51 in benefits for each \$1 invested. Annual benefits total \$22,166,000.

Some impacts on the trade and business economy and indirect benefits that will result from the project are:

Population increase in project area.....	17,500
New retail business establishments.....	650
New service establishments.....	190
New wholesale establishments.....	185
New manufacturing establishments.....	51
New job opportunities.....	4,500
Increase in nonfarm personal income.....	\$26,355,000
Increase in Federal income tax (annually).....	\$3,200,000
Increase in State income tax (annually).....	\$550,000

Conservative effects from other functions that the initial phase of the project will serve are an increase in migratory waterfowl production habitat by 20 percent; increase in fishing use by over 700 percent; and increase in recreation use by over 1,100,000 visitor days each year.

In undertaking the Garrison diversion project, the Federal Government would be making an investment that would pay for itself many times over. Studies indicate that over a 50-year period the increased income from individual farmers in the project area would yield Federal income tax revenues \$160 million higher than at present. Combined with \$25.5 million that would be returned to the Government from the irrigators and conservancy district, 98 percent of the cost allocated to irrigation would be covered. In addition, more than \$160 million will be available from surplus power revenues. These returns in the Federal Treasury far exceed the investment in the project.

The unit undoubtedly is one of the best planned irrigation projects that ever has been presented to Congress. Refined cost estimates indicate the construction cost of the initial phase is \$212,383,000. The project also has been assigned costs from investments already made for mainstem dams and power facilities totaling \$36,630,000.

Mr. President, more than 80 percent of the costs of the project will be repaid to the Federal Treasury by water users and from power revenues. The remaining

20 percent, associated with fish and wildlife enhancement, recreation and flood control, is considered to benefit the public at large and, according to national policy, does not have to be repaid.

The two best waterfowl production areas in the Nation are contained in the Garrison Diversion Unit area. The necessity of protecting these nationally significant areas and of improving these resources and the opportunities for the public to utilize and enjoy them are recognized throughout the project plan.

Thirty-six major and thirty minor areas constitute the fish and wildlife features of the plan. These areas will contain more than 56,000 acres of water and marsh that will have a constant and controllable water supply available, substantially enhancing the migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources of the area.

The people of North Dakota who stand to benefit from the Garrison Diversion Unit have expressed their willingness to assume their responsibilities. Nine years ago, they organized the 25-county Garrison Conservancy District, representing all the areas that will benefit from the project. The district was granted the authority to levy a general tax over all property within its boundaries to finance the repayment obligations for the project.

In addition, 9 irrigation districts, including about 420,000 acres of irrigable land, have been formed by potential irrigators. These districts stand ready to contract with the Federal Government for their share of the project costs.

The Garrison Diversion Unit not only will compensate my State for the land it has sacrificed for the Missouri River Basin Project, but its development is the key to new life to the area and new wealth to the region and the Nation.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give their approval to S. 178.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from North Dakota that this matter came up rather quickly, and that it is my fault that he was not notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the con-

sideration of Calendar No. 842, Senate Resolution 275.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A resolution (S. Res. 275) providing additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, \$10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 770, H.R. 2772.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** H.R. 2772 is now the pending business before the Senate. Is that correct?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. **HUMPHREY.** Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 10), 1964:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frederick C. Belen, of Michigan, to be Deputy Postmaster General, vice Sidney W. Bishop, resigned.

William M. McMillan, of Texas, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Frederick C. Belen, elevated.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development, vice Frank M. Coffin.

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and south Asia, Agency for International Development, vice William S. Gaud.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Marshall K. Phillips	Robert E. Gardner
Kenneth M. Lumsden	Clayton W. Collins, Jr.
Gordon R. Campbell	Ralph G. Isacson
Richard D. Mellette	Ronald McClellan
Martin F. Groff	

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Harry D. Smith	Harold E. Stanley
Paul J. Bouchard	Billy R. Mull
Daniel C. Mania	Leroy W. Peterson
Richard H. Hicks	Carl W. Snyder, Jr.
Robert E. Potts	Philip M. Lebet
Robert E. Diller	Edward A. Walsh

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Luther C. Heinz	Arnold F. Schade
Ralph L. Shifley	Charles E. Loughlin
Paul Masterton	James O. Cobb
George P. Koch	Thomas A. Christopher
George F. Pittard	Robert A. Macpherson
William M. McCormick	Carlton B. Jones
Robert L. Townsend	Paul D. Buie
Herman J. Kossler	James R. Reedy
Noel A. M. Gayler	Henry S. Monroe
Kenneth L. Veth	Lester R. Schulz
Draper L. Kauffman	Lester S. Chambers
Eugene B. Fluckey	John H. McQuilkin
Harry Hull	William F. Petrovic
Robert H. Weeks	James A. Brown
Thomas H. Morton	
John S. Coye, Jr.	
Joseph W. Williams, Jr.	

MEDICAL CORPS

Walter Welham

SUPPLY CORPS

Emory D. Stanley, Jr.
Stephen Sherwood

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Alexander C. Husband

The following-named Reserve officers for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

James D. Hardy	Robert W. Copeland
Harry H. Hess	Carl E. Watson
Eric C. Lambert	Leslie L. Reid
Thomas J. Killian	Robert H. Barnum
Leonard S. Bailey	Charles E. Rieben, Jr.
William M. McCloy	Stephen E. Jones
Ralph G. Coburn, Jr.	

MEDICAL CORPS

Moore Moore, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Harold W. Torgerson
Edgar H. Reeder

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Louis R. LaPorte

DENTAL CORPS

Alton K. Fisher

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abel, William H.	Adams, Chester A.
Abercrombie, Frank E.	Adams, James W.
Abernathy, William K.	Adams, Max L.
Ablowich, Dean A.	Adams, Raymond A.

Adams, Robert W.	Baker, Curtis L.
Adcock, Thomas W.	Baker, Hugh B.
Affer, Alan B.	Baker, Maurice R.
Affourtit, Daniel J., Jr.	Baker, Robert J.
Ahern, James W.	Baker, Robert P.
Akers, Bruce	Baker, Wayne E.
Akerson, Arthur C., Jr.	Baker, Willard D.
Albaugh, Cleve W.	Bakun, William D.
Albers, Robert J.	Baldwin, William E.
Albert, William A.	Ball, Willie H., Jr.
Alden, John H.	Ballard, James O.
Alexander, Dale E.	Ballard, William C.
Alexander, Willis H., Jr.	Ballou, Charles L.
	Ballou, Thomas B.
Allain, Charles J.	Bancroft, William P.
Allen, Bert L.	Banes, Robert E.
Allen, George R.	Bangert, William R.
Allen, James W.	Banister, Richard M.
Allen, Julian A.	Banks, Richard
Allen, Richard C.	Bannan, Edward K.
Allen, Robert J.	Barber, Robert F.
Allen, Stanley E.	Barber, Stephen W.
Allison, Robert E.	Banner, David R.
Allwine, Robert A.	Barbre, George W.
Alrick, Richard D.	Barclay, William A.
Alston, Vernon D.	Bard, Stephen A.
Amantea, Thomas R.	Bardelles, John L.
Amend, Robert J.	Barrell, John F.
Ames, Albert M.	Barlow, Johnnie T.
Anderson, Charles E.	Barnes, Vernon T.
Anderson, Earl N. J.	Barnaby, Kenneth A.
Anderson, Gordon R.	Barnes, Harley H., Jr.
Anderson, Gordon W.	Barnes, Harlan L.
Anderson, Ira B.	Barnicle, Paul E.
Anderson, James L.	Barns, David W.
Anderson, Lawrence G.	Baron, Michael
Anderson, Robert E.	Baron, Theodore L.
Anderson, Thomas M.	Barr, Charles T.
Anderson, Varro D.	Barrett, Hoyt S.
Andrasko, Michael B.	Barringer, Larry E.
Andrew, Kenneth C.	Barry, Kenneth R.
Anglin, Hubert L.	Barry, Richard D.
Anselmi, Ernest A., Jr.	Bartels, Albert L.
Anthony, John A., III	Bartholomew, Joseph
Anthony, John P., Jr.	W.
Antonio, Robert J.	Bartolett, Frank S., III
Aragona, Francis J.	Barton, Glenn L.
Arbogast, James B.	Barton, Jere A.
Arkin, William E.	Bartusek, Marlon E.
Armbruster, Robert E.	Basham, Darell C.
Arms, Fay H.	Bashaw, Lloyd W.
Arms, Philip B., Jr.	Bass, William F.
Armstrong, Charles E., Jr.	Bassett, James R.
	Batchellor, John K., Jr.
Arnaud Antoine J. A.	Bates, George E., Jr.
Arnett, Verlin M.	Bates, Henry W.
Arrasmith, Thomas M., III	Battaglia, William F.
Arsenault, Oscar W.	Batterton, George B.
Ashbaugh, Charles I.	Batti, Donald E.
Ashley, Roger T.	Baublitz, John E.
Aspas, Paul T.	Bauer, Jerry F.
Aulenbach, Glen L.	Baumann, Arthur C.
Aurell, Donald L.	Baumer, Donald G.
Ausley, Paul C., Jr.	Baxley, Jarman G.
Austin, Gene M.	Baxter, James B., Jr.
Austin, Leon	Bay, Warren H.
Averna, Vincent S.	Bazzel, Roderic C.
Avery, Charles G.	Beach, Venton E.
Avore, Malcolm A.	Beam, Henry H.
Ayre, Donald	Beam, James C.
Babb, Dewey E.	Bearshall, Elmer W., Jr.
Babcock, William L.	Beatty, Thomas J.
Bablash, William E.	Bechtold, Joseph M.
Bable, Samuel S.	Becker, Robert E.
Bacon, Daniel K.	Bee, Fred A.
Bacon, William S.	Beebe, Bruce A.
Baer, Robert D.	Beech, Henry D.
Baesman, Richard F.	Behling, Henry J.
Bahre, George L.	Belford, Ralph W.
Baller, Donald W., Jr.	Bell, Charles F.
Balley, Charles E., Jr.	Bell, Gary E.
Balley, Grover C., III	Bell, Ned D.
Balley, Howard L.	Bell, Nolle L.
Balley, James H.	Bell, Robert W., Jr.
Balley, Roy, Jr.	Belmont, Richard J.
Balley, Stanley J., Jr.	Bender, Thomas J.
Balmbridge, Horace H.	Benge, Albert H.
Baird, Dean D.	Benites, Robert D.
Baird, James D.	Bennett, Hugh M.
Baker, Arthur J., III	

- Bennett, Roger L.
Bennigson, Lawrence A.
Benoit, Felix
Bensinger, Darrell L.
Benson, James H.
Benson, Jerome E.
Benson, Leo, III
Benson, Perry S.
Benson, Peter H.
Berg, George W., Jr.
Bergert, James W.
Bergmann, Leland D.
Berigan, Francis M.
Berkey, Lloyd Allan
Berkite, Ronald B.
Berkowitz, Ross
Berry, James T.
Berry, Kenton C.
Berube, Raymond E. Jr.
Best, James B.
Betterson, Don M.
Betz, Dale S.
Beumer, Theodore H.
Beveridge, Jerry D.
Beyrle, Robert F.
Bicknell, James N.
Bickum, Gilbert W.
Biermann, Kenneth E.
Biggerstaff, Paul O.
Billings, David J.
Billings, Robert A.
Binder, Donald
Birchett, John A. K.
III
Birtwistle, Richard
III
Bisbing, Raymond H.
Bishop, Arles R.
Bishop, John A.
Bissell, Allen M.
Bissing, Walter W.
Bittner, Francis E.
Bixby, Joseph A.
Black, Oscar T.
Black, Phillip R.
Black, Rudolph R.
Blackburn, William J.
Blackstock, Fletcher L.
Blair, Charles R.
Blair, Joseph H., Jr.
Blair, Nelson A.
Blakeley, James H.
Blanchard, Everiste J.
Blanding, Richard L.
Blankenship, Thomas C.
Blick, Ernest C.
Bliss, Robert B., II
Blockinger, Alvin F., Jr.
Blome, Dennis J.
Blomquist, Richard O.
Blood, David H.
Bloodsworth, George E.
Bloore, John L.
Blubaugh, John G.
Blum, Ervin R.
Blunden, Alec R.
Boarman, John T.
Bodenner, George E.
Boecker, Donald V.
Boesenberg, John J.
Boggs, Dallas B.
Bohn, Charles J., Jr.
Bolczak, Wallace L.
Bolden, David R.
Bolinger, Charles W.
Bond, Duane A.
Bond, Lawson G.
Bone, Charles R.
Boney, David B.
Bonham, Charlie L.
Bonne, Gordon A.
Bonnevill, Joseph E., Jr.
Bonsall, Donald E.
Bonsky, William F.
Boomgaarden, Marvin E.
Boose, Donald E.
Booth, Ronald J.
Boreen, Allen R.
Borges, Robert F.
Bornemann, Alfred
Borris, Charles M.
Borinem, Russell A.
Bos, Peter G.
Bost, Donald W.
Boswell, Freddie L., Jr.
Bouchillon, Milton D.
Bourke, Robert H.
Bouscaren, William J.
Bowdoin, Bernarr M.
Bowen, Alfred G.
Bowley, Frederick C.
Bowling, Weldon J.
Bowman, Peter B.
Bowman, Robert J.
Bowser, John V.
Boyd, Thomas M.
Boyd, William T., III
Boyer, Larry A.
Boylan, James D.
Boyle, Francis J.
Boyle, Robert H.
Boyles, Aubrey L.
Bozarth, Jack E.
Bracken, Robert T.
Braden, Morse S.
Bradford, Alfred E.
Bradford, Erby D.
Bradt, Donald E.
Brady, John B.
Brandon, John R.
Brandquist, Roland
Branham, Powers E., Jr.
Branson, Harry W., Jr.
Bratton, James E.
Braun, Frank B.
Breckenridge, Donald R.
Bregenzler, Karl E.
Brehm, James H.
Brenton, Robert J.
Brewer, Eddie R.
Brewer, Shelby T.
Brewer, Vincent E.
Brice, Ronald E.
Bright, Calvin F.
Brimmage, Kirby L.
Bringham, William, Jr.
Bristol, William W.
Broach, John C.
Broadfield, Donald E.
Broadwell, William R.
Brocken, John F., Jr.
Brockhausen, Frederick C., Jr.
Brockman, John L., Jr.
Broglio, John D.
Brooks, Edward W.
Brooks, James S.
Brooks, Robert H.
Brouhle, William R.
Brown, Baldwin B.
Brown, Charles K.
Brown, Chester A.
Brown, Clyde E.
Brown, Donald H.
Brown, Edward E.
Brown, Elbert L., Jr.
Brown, Floyd W.
Brown, George R.
Brown, Harold E.
Brown, Lester M.
Brown, Marion L.
Brown, William L.
Bruning, Robert E.
Bruen, Richard J.
Brugman, Thomas C.
Brundridge, Harry L.
Brunnett, Carl E.
Brust, Philip J.
Bryan, John W.
Bryan, Timothy E.
Bryant, Cordis C.
Bryant, Donald W.
Bryant, Ernest W.
Bryant, Raymond, Jr.
Bryant, William H.
Bryant, William J.
Buchans, James C.
Buchart, John R.
Buehler, Roy R.
Buile, Ralph H.
Bullock, James P.
Burdett, Hubert W., Jr.
Burdett, Lawrence P.
Burdge, Ronald E.
Burgess, Kenneth L.
Burke, Robert D.
Burkette, Jerry W.
Burkhard, Charles D.
Burnett, William C.
Burnette, Ray E.
Burnham, Robert C.
Burnham, William T.
Burns, Walter W., Jr.
Burroughs, Eugene S., III
Burrows, Melvin M.
Burton, Robert E.
Bush, Thomas O.
Bush, William J.
Bushouer, Ronald F.
Butler, David E.
Butler, Harry P.
Bybee, Raymon A.
Byrne, Barry J.
Byrne, Edward M.
Byrne, Robert A.
Byrnes, Albert M.
Byrnes, Henry F., Jr.
Callahan, Thomas J.
Callaway, Linnaeus T.
Callaway, William E., Jr.
Calvert, William R.
Cameron, James J.
Cameron, Robert F.
Cameron, Thomas A.
Camp, William P.
Campbell, Albert M.
Cannon, William T.
Canup, Theodore, Jr.
Capito, George R.
Carbajal, Ruben
Carey, William F.
Carlson, Frederick P.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carlson, John A.
Carlson, Patrick J.
Carman, Jesse L.
Carnathan, Fred H.
Caron, Francis O.
Carpenter, John D., Jr.
Carper, Teddy G.
Carr, Robert E.
Carrier, Milton G.
Carroll, Francis L.
Carruthers, David G.
Carson, Harold R.
Carson, Richard L.
Carter, Charles W. P.
Carter, Frederick T.
Carwin, Paul L.
Case, Calvin W.
Casey, Stephen H.
Cassaday, Charles R.
Castle, Willis R.
Caswell, Gordon C.
Cater, Charles E.
Cates, Donald E.
Cathey, Carl D.
Catron, Delbert F.
Cavey, Morris N.
Cawthon, Alon E.
Caylor, Daniel R.
Cecll, John P.
Cerul, John P., Jr.
Cesarlo, Richard A.
Chabot, Peter G.
Chain, David A.
Chalfour, Clark L.
Chambers, Thomas D.
Chancy, Eugene J.
Chandler, Harold, Jr.
Chapman, Charles
Charters, Michael F.
Chase, Leroy O.
Chetion, Edward E.
Chenard, John H.
Chenoweth, Eldred E.
Cherry, William G., Jr.
Chesnutt, Billy
Chew, David G.
Chidlow, Douglas O.
Childers, John V.
Chiles, Henry G., Jr.
Chrisman, Rex C.
Christensen, Merle L.
Christian, Howard B.
Christian, John T.
Christopher, Charles E.
Church, Edgar C.
Cima, Frank J.
Ciocca, Michael A.
Clotti, Anthony
Cislo, Walter J.
Claman, John S.
Clark, Alfred L.
Clark, Daniel B.
Clark, Donald D.
Clark, George N.
Clark, Joseph A.
Clark, Kenneth G.
Clark, Menzo T.
Clark, Theodore L.
Clark, Warren H.
Clark, William M.
Clark, William E.
Clark, William T.
Claunch, James I.
Clawson, Carl H., Jr.
Claxton, Irvin O.
Clay, Theodore A.
Clemente, William J.
Clements, Thomas J.
Clemons, Melvin B.
Cler, Alfred J., Jr.
Cleveland, Spencer
Clexton, Edward W., Jr.
Click, Raymond D.
Cliff, Jesse C.
Clifton, William E.
Clinton, John J.
Cloutier, Adore H.
Clover, Glen E.
Coates, Thomas A.
Cockram, John C.
Cofar, Horace G.
Coffelt, Robert O.
Coffey, John A.
Coffey, Wiley E., Jr.
Cogdell, Gary B.
Cogdill, Thomas J.
Colburn, Richard E.
Colby, Kenneth R.
Cole, Joseph D.
Cole, Kennard E.
Cole, William F.
Colegrove, Robert J.
Coleman, Glenn W.
Coleman, Jessie V.
Coleman, Thomas M.
Coleman, William E.
Coles, George E., Jr.
Colkitt, George R., Jr.
Colley, Michael C.
Collcott, Charles R.
Collier, Wilmer G., Jr.
Collins, Bernice W.
Collins, Dan E.
Collins, Ed N.
Collins, William T.
Colonna, Michael A.
Combemale, Jeanloup R.
Comeau, Charles R.
Comiskey, Michael R.
Condit, Norman E.
Confer, William A., Jr.
Conner, Lewis W.
Conner, William T., Jr.
Conner, Willis D.
Conyers, Thomas R.
Cook, Charles I.
Cook, James J.
Coolican, Donald J.
Cooper, Jerry A.
Cooper, Paul W., Jr.
Corbelle, Reginald C.
Cordell, Glen D.
Corkill, James L.
Cornwell, Alton E.
Correll, Robert A.
Correll, Robert D.
Cote, Arthur J.
Cotterman, Andrew G.
Coughlen, Thomas D.
Coughlin, Daniel T., Jr.
Coulapides, Anthony C.
Coulter, Glenn R.
Council, William G.
Court, Charles W.
Courtney, James R.
Cowan, Herbert W.
Cowan, William L.
Cowles, David E.
Cox, Charles J.
Cox, Donald J.
Cox, Joseph W.
Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Lynn O.
Cox, Paul L.
Cox, Thaddeus C.
Craig, Charles E., Jr.
Cranford, Leon B.
Craver, William D.
Crawford, Denis H.
Crawford, John C.
Crayton, Johnny L.
Craze, James W.
Creed, William K.
Creter, Arthur P., Jr.
Crigler, Charles H.
Crisman, John C.
Criste, David M.
Crockett, Richard L.
Cronfel, Ramsey L.
Crossland, Clifford T.
Crow, Hugh E.
Crow, Robert L.
Crowder, Kenneth L.
Crowder, Thomas E.
Crowley, Lawrence F.
Csernelabics, Richard C.
Cullen, Donald C.
Cumella, Walter S.
Cumm, Homer J., Jr.
Cummings, Michael G.
Cummings, Vincent P., Jr.
Cummins, Glen S.
Cunningham, Glenn J.
Cunningham, Donald E.
Cupp, Larry L.
Curling, Fred B.
Curtis, Grant R.
Curtis, Jon E.
Curtis, Thomas G.
Curtiss, Daniel J.
Dahlem, Francis E.
Dahlgren, Arthur W.
Dahlgren, Charles E.
Dally, Donald E.
Dally, Roger M.
Dale, Henry
Dalessio, Robert M.
Danforth, William L.
Dankievitch, John A.
Darling, Frank R.
Daschbach, Joseph F.
Dascombe, Ronald E.
Davidson, Dennis M.
Davidson, Richard E.
Davidson, William G., III
Davies, Robert L.
Davies, William E., Jr.
Davis, Doyle L.
Davis, Francis J.
Davis, George W., VI
Davis, Jack A.
Davis, Leonard G.
Davis, Richard B.
Davis, Vibert H.
Day, Robert O.
Deaton, John H.
Decker, Cecil E.
Decker, John P.
Deehan, Paul K.
Dehaemer, Michael J.
Dehler, Richard F.
Dehn, William S., Jr.
Delamorton, Howard F. B.
Deloach, Jesse H.
Deloury, Edward M., Jr.
Delp, George D.
Deipaine, Nick, Jr.
Delude, Howard D.
Demirjian, Edward
Demitropoulos, Alexander
Dempsey, Richard E.
Dempster, Duncan F.
Denberger, Jerome N.
Denn, George E., Jr.
Dennis, Merrill L.
Denson, James K.
Deore, Donald A.
Depperschmidt, Robert F.
Deptula, Joseph
Derouin, Norman E.
Derr, Thomas A.
Dettloff, Edward D.
Devenny, John P., Jr.
Devine, Ralph R.
Devine, Thomas W.
Dewinn, Donald A.
Dexter, Dillon C.
Diamond, Glenn B.
Dibble, John P.
Dickinson, Norman R.
Dicketson, Paul B.
Dietrich, Lawrence H.
Digiovanni, Armand F., Jr.
Dilley, David
Dillingham, Donald R.
Dillon, John P.
Dimartino, Joseph D.
Dinger, Harlan E.
Dinning, Donald McP.
Dirksen, John V.
Dix, Donald W.
Dobbie, Donald W.
Dobes, Joseph C.
Dobrosky, John
Dodd, James H., Jr.
Dodge, Elmer L., Jr.
Dodson, Richard E.
Doeg, Arthur G.
Dolan, Peter B.
Donahue, James E.
Donahue, Thomas M.
Donnelly, John J.
Donofrio, Anthony L.
Donovan, Larry C.
Dooley, John J.
Doose, John C.
Dorough, Vernon R.
Dothard, Joseph R.
Dotterer, Kenneth R.
Dougherty, Thomas G.
Doughty, Robert
Douglass, Willie B.
Dovalgo, Richard R.
Dowell, George W., III
Downey, Edward V.
Downey, Harry J.
Doyle, John F.
Draper, Lilbourne E.
Draughon, Harry C., Jr.
Dreher, Robert H.
Dressor, Robert F.
Drummond, William K.
Drury, Melvin R.
Duchnick, Stanley M.
Dudley, James I., Jr.
Duff, Robert D.
Duffy, Francis K.

- Duffy, James F.
 Dufore, Maurice C.
 Duggan, Edward H., Jr.
 Duley, Donald G.
 Duling, Martin L.
 Dunbar, Bartlett S.
 Duncan, Angus F.
 Duncan, John W.
 Duncan, Lawrence D.
 Dunlap, Howard D.
 Dunlop, Herbert J.
 Dunn, Gilliam S.
 Dunn, James M.
 Dunn, Stephen
 Dunne, Lawrence E.
 Dupont, Robert A.
 Durkin, Wallace M.
 Durocher, Joseph W.
 Dutton, Bruce M.
 Dvorak, Allan R.
 Dye, Jessie D.
 Dyer, Harold D.
 Dyke, Conrad S.
 Dzema, John
 Earl, Frank S.
 Earle, Joseph T.
 Earle, Ronald L., Jr.
 Eaton, Allan L.
 Eayre, Dean C.
 Eberle, John D.
 Eberlein, Bernard E.
 Eckerman, Orvin E.
 Edgar, Peter D.
 Edwards, Ronald
 Eighth, Dean W.
 Elertsen, James T.
 Ekberg, Elden A.
 Elkins, Paul, W.
 Elliott, Robert O.
 Ellis, Elwood G.
 Ellis, Martin A.
 Ellis, Russell D.
 Ellis, Willie C.
 Ellis, Marvin R.
 Elmore, Cleo A.
 Elmquist, Robert J.
 Elster, Robert E.
 Embry, Hugh C.
 Emrick, Grover O.
 Endsley, James E.
 Enriquez, Jose
 Erdei, Elmer A.
 Ernest, Charles L.
 Eshom, Roy L.
 Esslinger, Jon H.
 Ester, Fred R.
 Etchells, Edward J.
 Evans, Harry H.
 Evans, Homer D.
 Evans, James R.
 Evans, Neal C.
 Evans, Oliver K.
 Evans, William E.
 Evans, William L.
 Evans, William R.
 Everding, George A.
 Everman, Leon E.
 Everson, Richard W.
 Ewalt, Frederick M.
 Ewing, Keith R.
 Fadden, Byron M.
 Fahsbender, Thomas F.
 Falk, Dennis J.
 Faller, Arthur R.
 Fallin, Thomas B.
 Fang, George W.
 Fant, Iley W.
 Farley, Robert T.
 Farnham, Robert
 Farrell, Norman L.
 Farris, Claude P., Jr.
 Fay, Frederick O., Jr.
 Fay, Vincent P.
 Febel, Joel W.
 Fee, Jerome J.
 Felguth, Ernest G.
 Felix, Dennis F.
 Fellis, Richard T.
 Fellows, John A.
 Fenn, Michael R.
 Ferguson, Harry R.
 Ferguson, Norman C.
 Fernandez, Harvey M.
 Ferranti, Nicholas A.
 Ferrell, John C.
 Ferris, Raymond B.
 Fetterman, Leroy W.
 Fiedeldej, Joseph W., Jr.
 Field, Royal R., Jr.
 Fields, Floyd H., Jr.
 Fields, George W.
 Finkelstein, Milton M.
 Finucan, Thomas E.
 Firebaugh, Charles D.
 Fischer, Charles F., II
 Fisher, Ben H.
 Fisher, Cornelius W.
 Fisher, George D.
 Fisher, Robert A.
 Fisher, Thomas J.
 Fitzgerald, Raymond N.
 Fitzgerald, James F.
 Fix, James E.
 Flanagan, Alan H.
 Fleitz, William V., Jr.
 Fleming, Charles H., Jr.
 Fleming, Michael J.
 Flesch, Robert W.
 Flinn, John E.
 Florence, Earle S.
 Flores, Arthur J.
 Fluke, John W.
 Flynn, Gerrish C.
 Flynn, Henry M., Jr.
 Flynn, William J.
 Foberg, Raymond H.
 Foery, Donald G.
 Fogel, Edwin L.
 Foley, James A.
 Foley, William H., Jr.
 Follett, John R.
 Foistad, Hartley I.
 Folta, Kenneth D.
 Folts, Roger H.
 Ford, Marvin J.
 Foreman, Earl L.
 Forsman, Jalmar F., Jr.
 Fortenberry, William S.
 Fortney, Doyle W.
 Foster, George S.
 Foster, Hiram A.
 Foster, Ralph V.
 Foster, William Leslie, Jr.
 Foster, William
 Lewright
 Fournier, Leo R.
 Fowler, Richard C.
 Fox, Henry W.
 Fox, Joe E.
 Fox, Robert E.
 Foy, Frederick D.
 Frailey, Julius R.
 France, Donald F.
 Frank, Sammy L.
 Franklin, David C.
 Fraser, Dale H.
 Frasher, John A.
 Frazier, Kendall L.
 Freedman, Leonard A.
 Freehill, Robert L.
 Freeman, Michael H.
 Freiberg, Harold M.
 Freiheit, James E.
 Fresco, Nace E.
 Friedmann, Alfred R.
 Friend, Leslie E.
 Frontz, Richard F.
 Frost, Norman C., Jr.
 Fuller, Donald S.
 Fuller, Richard E.
 Funston, Walter H., Jr.
 Furlong, Joseph W.
 Furnholm, William G.
 Furr, Jack C.
 Fuss, Donald D.
 Fussell, William R., Jr.
 Gadsby, Donald F.
 Gagliardo, James E.
 Galley, Lonnie D., Jr.
 Galamaga, Donald P.
 Gale, Earl L.
 Gallagher, Thomas J.
 Gallagher, James T.
 Gallagher, Michael T.
 Gallegos, Joe R.
 Galloway, Earl W.
 Gamba, Robert V.
 Gandy, Asa J.
 Gardner, Helsey E.
 Garduno, John F.
 Garfield, Peter J.
 Garner, Richard E.
 Garrett, Loren E.
 Garrison, Joe R.
 Garver, Bruce M.
 Gasser, Robert E.
 Gauthier, Charles C.
 Gauthier, David P.
 Gaviak, Michael W.
 Gaydos, Cyril M. G.
 Geer, David W.
 Geiman, Thomas E.
 Gehrlich, Richard E.
 Geiger, William A.
 Geiling, Terry L.
 Gellinas, Norman H.
 Geller, John B.
 Gephart, Ernest B.
 Gerasimoff, Philip J.
 Gerber, Eugene D.
 Gerly, Robert S.
 Germain, Russell F.
 Gershon, Jon J.
 Gessner, Lynn E.
 Gibson, Edward T.
 Gibson, Harvey D.
 Gibson, James W.
 Gieseke, William D.
 Gieske, Neal D.
 Gilbreath, David S.
 Gilchrist, Orville L.
 Gill, Donald L.
 Gillen, Robert F.
 Gillespie, William M.
 Gillespie, Clarence E., Jr.
 Gillett, Lewis C., Jr.
 Gillis, John W.
 Gilstrap, James R. L.
 Gingles, William G.
 Gingold, Joel E.
 Gipson, Jack D.
 Glaspell, Grayson M.
 Glotfelty, Robert L.
 Gneckow, Gerald E.
 Godwin, Gordon T.
 Goff, Franklin L.
 Goforth, James E., Jr.
 Golden, George H., Jr.
 Golden, Mark M.
 Gonsalves, David
 Goode, Sanchez
 Goodrich, Walker R., Jr.
 Goodwin, Willis M.
 Gorecki, Walter
 Gordon, Bradley W.
 Gordon, Frank
 Gordon, Max H.
 Gosselin, Henry E., Jr.
 Gost, William J.
 Goubeaux, Richard F.
 Gould, Daniel H.
 Gould, George W.
 Grafel, Lynn H.
 Grafton, Jay T.
 Graham, Ernest A.
 Graham, Frank
 Graham, James R.
 Graham, William B.
 Graham, William W.
 Grant, Carroll D.
 Grant, Dale P.
 Grantham, Frank H.
 Graves, Bibb L.
 Gray, Gordon L.
 Green, Conrad G.
 Green, Lorin D.
 Green, Richard M.
 Greenberg, Abe
 Greenberg, Samuel J.
 Greene, Cecil M.
 Gregg, William G.
 Gregory, James W.
 Greninger, John J.
 Gretter, Gary J.
 Gridley, Robert H.
 Griffin, Clyde W.
 Griffin, Robert N.
 Grimes, Fred H.
 Grisemer, Alan N.
 Grochowski, Edward F.
 Groggett, Richard W., Jr.
 Grose, Herbert T.
 Groth, John F.
 Growe, Robert G.
 Grunstra, James
 Grzech, Leon W.
 Guess, Robert E.
 Guglielmo, Salvatore F.
 Guice, Louis K.
 Gustavson, Roy S.
 Guter, Richard J.
 Haas, Phillip E.
 Hadley, Richard J.
 Hafer, Otto D.
 Hagen, John M.
 Hagerty, Cornelius J., Jr.
 Haggerty, John F.
 Haines, Floyd C.
 Haisten, John, Jr.
 Hakanson, Gary E.
 Haker, Carl L.
 Haldiman, Martin F.
 Hale, Frederick G.
 Hall, Benjamin S.
 Hallman, Lee A.
 Hallowell, Benjamin H., Jr.
 Halpin, Hugh
 Hamby, Thomas, Jr.
 Hames, William J.
 Hamilton, Plez
 Hamilton, Richard T.
 Hamilton, William C., Jr.
 Hamm, Roger G.
 Hamm, William D.
 Hammer, Karl L.
 Hammond, Charles M., Jr.
 Hamon, Richard W.
 Hampton, Harry W.
 Hampton, Thomas D.
 Hanberry, Royce S.
 Hancock, Eugene W.
 Hancock, James E.
 Hand, David R.
 Hanes, Quana C.
 Haney, Raymond E.
 Hankins, Jack T.
 Hansen, Eigl L., Jr.
 Hansen, Kirby W., Jr.
 Hansen, Roy E.
 Hanson, Ralph E., Jr.
 Hanson, Ronald D.
 Hanvey, James W.
 Harden, Jon D.
 Hardesty, Michael A.
 Hardgrave, James L.
 Hardin, Billie R.
 Hardin, Bruce H.
 Hardman, Herbert F.
 Hardt, William A.
 Hargrave, Paul E.
 Hargrove, James C.
 Harker, Donald A.
 Harkness, Melvin D.
 Harmer, William H.
 Harmon, Edward K.
 Harmon, Elmer L., Jr.
 Harnadek, Joseph J.
 Harrell, Richard E.
 Harris, Carl E., Jr.
 Harris, "J" "M"
 Harris, Jack D.
 Harris, William J.
 Harrison, Granvel L.
 Harrison, Joe P.
 Harrison, Marion C.
 Harrison, William L.
 Hart, Clifford A.
 Hart, Edward M.
 Hart, Irving H., III
 Hart, John A.
 Harter, Gary L.
 Hartman, Clarence P.
 Hartman, Herbert C.
 Hartsell, Clyde W.
 Hartz, Edward E.
 Haskell, Edward G.
 Haskell, Richard D.
 Hassel, William G., Jr.
 Hastie, William J.
 Hatckett, Monroe T.
 Hatfield, Everette
 Hatley, Carmon W.
 Hatton, William C.
 Haughton, David E.
 Haungs, Richard E.
 Havery, John W.
 Hawkey, Robert J.
 Hayes, Charles W.
 Hayes, James W.
 Hayes, Raymond R.
 Hays, Jimmie D.
 Hays, Russell O.
 Hazard, Edward P., Jr.
 Hazelwood, Ernest R.
 Hazucha, Paul C.
 Heacock, Louis W.
 Head, Thomas A.
 Healy, Patrick R.
 Heasley, Allen D.
 Heath, David M.
 Heckman, Ronald W.
 Heckman, Robert J.
 Hedley, Peter F.
 Heffernan, Charles F.
 Heger, Wayne F.
 Hegg, Daniel R.
 Heilpern, Roger F.
 Hellyer, James A.
 Helms, David F.
 Helms, Lawrence S.
 Helsing, Jack
 Henry, Jack M.
 Henderson, Thomas S.
 Hendry, John A.
 Hennessey, John T.
 Henning, Harold E.
 Henzli, John T.
 Hensley, Hershaw W.
 Heppburn, Raymond G.
 Herbel, John G.
 Herbert, Robert W.
 Herkert, Richard H.
 H.
 Herring, "J" Michael
 Hervey, John C., Jr.
 Hess, Aubrie D.
 Hettich, Bobby S.
 Heuberger, Nathan A.
 Heying, Ernest H.
 Heyneman, Russell E.
 Hickey, Dennis J., IV
 Hickey, Edward F.
 Hickman, Joseph C.
 Hickman, Junior D.
 Hicks, Horace R.
 Hicks, William D.
 Hilder, Lewis E.
 Hill, Charles W., Jr.
 Hill, Frederick W., Jr.
 Hindal, Marvin O.
 Hinely, Elliott P.
 Hinkel, Jay E.
 Hinkel, Ronald W.
 Hinton, Aloneous S., Jr.
 Hite, Thomas H.
 Hixson, John D.
 Hoch, Robert G., Jr.
 Hodges, Myron W.
 Hoecker, Richard G.
 Hoernlein, Russell P.
 Hoffman, Carl K.
 Hoffman, Drake A.
 Hoffman, Hubert L.
 Hoffman, Joseph F., Jr.
 Hoffman, Richard P.
 Hoke, John R., II
 Holcomb, Edward L.
 Holden, Durward B.
 Holland, Donald M.
 Holloway, Richard E.
 Holmes, John A.
 Holmes, Roland E.
 Holtz, Robert S.
 Hood, William J.
 Hood, William S., Jr.
 Hoppin, Thomas B.
 Horn, Floyd E., Jr.
 Horn, Frank G.
 Hornaday, Gregg W.
 Hornsby, Michael D.
 Horsch, Arthur R.
 Horton, Andrew S.
 Horton, Jack O., Jr.
 Horton, Norman L.
 Howard, Albert O., Jr.
 Howard, Lee F.
 Howe, Donald L.
 Howell, Frederick J.
 Howell, Norman B.
 Howell, Swebston S., Jr.
 Howerton, Norman J.
 Hubbard, Charles W., Jr.
 Hubbard, Clarence H.
 Hubbard, Orrin E.
 Hubbard, Terrence C.
 Huberman, Benjamin
 Hudson, Jack D.
 Hughes, Emerson J., Jr.
 Hughes, Joe P.
 Hughes, Royston C.
 Hughes, Roy J.
 Hugo, James W.
 Huhn, John H.
 Hulvershorn, Frederick W.
 Hunnell, William R.
 Hunt, Frank M., Jr.
 Hunt, George W., Jr.
 Hunter, Jack E.
 Hunter, Raymond A.
 Huntley, Donald E.
 Hurlburt, Joseph S.
 Hutchins, James R.
 Hutchinson, Aubry B.
 Hutt, Thomas E., Jr.
 Hyde, Thomas A.
 Hyde, Walter J.
 Ianucci, Robert J.
 Ide, Henry C.
 Ieuter, Fredric E.
 Iig, Raymond P.
 Inderlied, William T., III
 Ireland, Delbert H.
 Irons, Gary S.
 I vine, Kenneth M.
 Irving, Verne H.
 Isaksen, George A.
 Isenburg, William, Jr.
 Ivy, Richard G.
 Iwatsu, David K.
 Jackson, John P.
 Jacobs, Lawrence R.
 Jacobson, Clyde A.
 Jacobson, Gerald
 James, Aaron C.
 James, John D.
 James, Stephen R.
 James, Cornell M.
 Janke, Roger A.
 Jaskolski, Kenneth J.
 Jaye, James M., Jr.
 Jeffreys, Robert E.
 Jenkins, Clifton W.
 Jenkins, Wendal L.
 Jennings, Lawrence F.
 Jennings, William T.
 Jensen, James L., Jr.

- Jensen, Melvin H.
Jerding, Frederick N.
Jerrell, Donald G.
Jeske, Donald C.
Jochem, Raymond D.
Joorres, Donald C.
Johannessen, Robert E.
Johniken, Teddy A.
Johns, Homer C., Jr.
Johns, James E.
Johnsen, Donald C.
Johnson, Albert P., Jr.
Johnson, Clayton A.
Johnson, Clayton J.
Johnson, Clinton B.
Johnson, Donn R.
Johnson, Frederick B.
Johnson, Iver R.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, James W.
Johnson, Joseph H.
Johnson, Kenneth A.
Johnson, Kenneth S.
Johnson, Kenneth
Johnson, Larry D.
Johnson, Melvin E.
Johnson, Robert C.
Johnson, Ronald B.
Johnson, Ronald E.
Johnson, Stephen, Jr.
Johnston, Douglas M., Jr.
Johnston, James R.
Johnston, Lawrence H., Jr.
Johnston, Robert A.
Jones, Calvin L.
Jones, Charles D.
Jones, Gordon S.
Jones, Hugh S.
Jones, Jerry S.
Jones, John R.
Jones, Joseph J.
Jones, Keith S.
Jones, Raymond G., Jr.
Jones, Robert E.
Jones, Ronald L.
Jones, Wallace E.
Jones, Walter R.
Jones, William H.
Joost, Rodney E.
Jordan, Alexander J., Jr.
Jordan, Aubrey H.
Jordan, John L., Jr.
Jorgensen, Ejnar O.
Jortner, Marvin W.
Joy, Joseph E.
Juergens, Kenneth C.
Junker, Howard R.
Kaelln, James N.
Kagy, Virgil C.
Kahler, Robert C.
Kalb, David G.
Kalenowsky, John E.
Kanady, Garland H., Jr.
Karamelas, Angelo N.
Karl, Daniel D.
Kartvedt, Maynard O.
Kauffman, Lawrence B.
Kaullen, Fred P.
Kay, Francis D.
Kazebee, Raymond G.
Kear, Patrick V.
Kearney, Laurence J., Jr.
Keating, Arthur L.
Keen, Burlin J.
Keenum, Guy
Keepin, Robert H.
Kehm, William C.
Keinrath, Frank C.
Keister, Jamleson C.
Keith, Joseph
Keithline, William W.
Kellikoa, Edward N.
Kelley, Thomas G.
Kelly, Michael J., Jr.
Kelsay, Leslie R.
- Keltner, Jackie L.
Kennedy, Eugene M.
Kennedy, Jerry F.
Kennedy, Joseph A.
Kenney, John M.
Kennon, Jack A.
Kephart, Robert M.
Kephart, Robert V.
Kerner, Leon W.
Kerns, Alexander H.
Kerns, Ernest C.
Kerns, Lyle K.
Kesler, Gene P.
Key, Paul L., II
Khouri, Charles R., Jr.
Kilgallon, James R.
Killen, Kenneth B.
Killinger, Edwin E.
Kincheloe, Lawrence R.
King, James W.
King, Jerry C.
King, Kenneth P.
King, Tom M.
Kingsbury, Karl C.
Kingsley, Frederic T.
Kinney, James R.
Kinnie, Phillip B., Jr.
Kirklen, Jack L.
Kiser, Hoyt, Jr.
Kiser, William R.
Kishel, Gene F.
Kitch, Dale
Kitzmiller, Oscar V.
Klauegger, Robert B.
Kling, Thomas C., Jr.
Klingebiel, Alfred C.
Knapp, Carl A.
Knight, Dennis R.
Knight, Vaughn L.
Knoll, John R.
Knorr, David J.
Knouse, Phillip K.
Knowles, Charles E.
Knutz, James E.
Koberg, John A.
Kobylarczyk, Clarence E.
Koch, Charles E., II
Koh, Barry
Kohl, Orlin A.
Kohut, Joseph J.
Konetchy, George J.
Konewko, Everett L.
Koonz, Ronald L.
Korbs, Donald E.
Korchek, Charles S.
Korte, Joseph N.
Kortge, Bernard W.
Korzensky, George J., Jr.
Kowall, Robert J.
Kramer, Harvey F.
Krause, Eugene S.
Kreassig, Richard M.
Kreiner, Edward T.
Kreps, Oren A.
Krese, Robert A.
Kretschmar, Karl H.
Kristensen, Gall A.
Kromer, Ronald C.
Kropac, John R.
Kroyer, George P.
Krullsch, Alan H.
Kubishen, Michael A.
Kuckelkorn, Josef S.
Kuhlman, William
Kuhrt, Edward C.
Kujawa, Gall S.
Kundrat, Reginald
Kunkie, Robert E.
Laber, George E.
Labanc, Harold S.
Lacette, Robert L.
Lachnicht, John F.
Lafferty, Patrick J.
Lafrance, Gerald
Lain, Calvin E.
Laiippy, Charles T.
Lairson, Don D.
- Lake, John T.
Lakin, Charles R.
Lamb, Donald K.
Lamb, Jay W.
Lambertson, Roy F., Jr.
Lambertson, Wayne R.
Lammers, Lennis L.
Lamontagne, Richard R.
Land, Walter R.
Landry, John A.
Lane, Clinton R.
Lane, "J" "D"
Lane, John W.
Lang, James R.
Lang, Joseph M., Jr.
Lang, Peter T.
Langdon, Stewart D.
Langen, Joseph H.
Langston, James D.
Lanham, Michael S.
Lanini, Harold M.
Lanning, Bruce E.
Lanouette, Raymond F.
Lansdowne, Alan E.
Lantz, Phillip E.
Large, Elwyn F.
Larkin, Eugene F., Jr.
Larsen, Lawrence M.
Larsen, Richard H.
Larson, Richard M.
Larson, Stanley M.
Lasch, Charles A.
Latimer, Peyton R.
Laukattis, Edward F.
Laurvick, Richard E.
Laux, William J.
Lavelle, John M.
Lavery, Richard J., III
Lawinski, Henry A.
Lawrence, Frederick W.
Lawrence, Henry L. H., Jr.
Lawson, Fred W.
Leader, John C.
Leahy, John F., III
LeBlanc, Henry R.
Lebrecht, Clifford W.
Ledbetter, Gary C.
Leduc, Ernest R.
Lee, Lawrence L.
Lee, Robert C.
Lee, Tommy H.
Lees, Michael J.
Legare, Thomas C. R., Jr.
Leggett, Melvin E.
Lehane, Jeremiah J., Jr.
Leimonas, Sigitas
Leipold, Frederick J.
Lekebusch, Adolf O.
LeMaster, James L.
LeMaster, Morris
Lemond, William T.
Leonard, William J.
Leszczynski, Edward J.
Letourneau, Joseph R. L.
Lettington, Thomas F.
Levasseur, Rudolph G.
Levasseur, Marshall J., Jr.
Levine, Emil H.
Lew, Girard T.
Lewis, Harry C.
Lewis, Porter, Jr.
Lewis, Ralph M.
Lewis, William E., Jr.
Libert, John J.
Lickfold, Frederick R., III
Lightner, Robert B.
Lilly, Joseph W.
Lind, Eugene E.
Lindsay, George W.
- Lindsey, James A.
Lindstrom, Gordon E.
Linendoll, John A.
Linn, Joe E.
Lippold, Walter J.
Littell, Gerald L.
Litten, Robert A.
Littlefield, James W.
Litzinger, Richard F.
Livingston, James M.
Livingston, Gerald W.
Lloyd, Roger M.
Lloyd, Roger W.
Lloyd, William B., Jr.
Locher, James R.
Locher, William W.
Lockie, William E., Jr.
Loden, Richard L.
Loebel, Leonard F.
Logan, Alexander S.
Logan, Billy B.
Logue, John F.
Logue, Richard J.
Lomax, Norman
Long, Gaeton, A., Jr.
Long, Joseph
Long, William C.
Longdon, Robert S.
Longmeyer, Norman H.
Longton, Edward B.
Looman, Bernard J.
Lopresti, Frank P.
Love, Bonnie R.
Lovejoy, James L.
Loveland, Kenneth W.
Loveland, Lynn S.
Lowe, Robert W.
Lowery, Fred H., Jr.
Lowman, Raymond D.
Lowrey, Donald F.
Lowsley, Ivon H., Jr.
Loy, Donald L.
Lucas, Edward
Lucas, James E.
Luce, George B.
Luke, John C.
Lukert, James L.
Lund, Frederick M.
Lunny, Robert M.
Lusby, John F.
Lusignan, John M.
Lusk, James B., Jr.
Lynch, Edward T., Jr.
Lynch, James B., Jr.
Lynch, John F., Jr.
Lyons, Daniel B.
Mabry, Fred W., Jr.
MacDonald, Walter F.
MacFadden, Robin C.
Machholz, Donald E.
Mackay, George W.
Macke, Richard C.
Mackie, David L.
MacKinnon, William B.
MacLeod, Kenneth L., III
MacNevin, James E.
Macdigan, William P.
Magnussen, Norman J.
Mahany, Walter H.
Mahathey, Clague O.
Maignan, Christopher A.
Maki, Weldon E.
Makovic, George S.
Makowski, Walter F.
Mallari, William A.
Malmberg, Norman R.
Malone, Claude H.
Malone, Elmer D.
Malone, John P.
Mamer, Edwin J.
Manlove, James C.
Mann, Harry P.
Mann, Robert
Manning, William S.
Mansell, Waymond
Manser, Robert J.
Mansi, Leon
Manuel, John F.
- Marburger, George G., Jr.
Mares, David L.
Mariano, Gilbert T., Jr.
Marinelli, Leonard F., Jr.
Marker, William J.
Marlin, Richard E.
Marquis, David R.
Marr, George M.
Marsh, Frank J., Jr.
Marshall, James Samuel
Marshall, James
Marshall, Ronald P.
Martel, Normal L.
Marti, Thomas J.
Martin, Clifford I.
Martin, Frank
Martin, Glynn
Martin, Joseph R. R.
Martin, Thomas D.
Mashburn, Charles A.
Mason, Charles C.
Mason, Ronald R.
Mathews, James E., Jr.
Matthew, Gall E.
Mattson, Karl R.
Matulka, Robert D.
Mauro, Peter J.
Maxfield, Jack M.
May, Walter A.
Maynard, Mark J.
Maynard, Theodore W.
Mayo, John B., Jr.
Mazzan, Carl A., Jr.
McAfee, Robert E.
McAfee, Robert S.
McAfee, Ronald J.
McCabe, Michael J.
McCall, James R.
McCallum, Carl P.
McCarthy, Robert J.
McCartney, Roy S., Jr.
McCaskill, Charles E., Jr.
McCausland, John E.
McClanahan, Ashby A.
McClanahan, Ted
McClarren, Ralph G.
McCloskey, Terry J.
McClure, Melvin M.
McClure, Thomas W.
McConnell, James T.
McConnell, James M.
McCormack, Elmer L.
McCormick, Walter S., Jr.
McCormick, Ollie B.
McCourtney, Theo H., Jr.
McCoy, Jimmy H.
McCoy, Jimmie D.
McCracken, Robert F.
McCracken, William P.
McCrorck, John C., Jr.
McCullough, Larry D.
McCullough, Michael S.
McCune, George B.
McDole, James E.
McDonald, Lee R.
McDonald, William M.
McDonell, John G.
McDonnell, Lawrence J.
McDonough, Thomas F.
McDougall, Donald J.
McDowell, Thomas N.
McDowell, William A., Jr.
McEwan, Donald P.
McFadden, Donald O.
McFarlane, Robert D.
McGargill, Mark
McGahey, James F.
- McGaw, Robert
McGinn, John P., Jr.
McGonegal, William F.
McGovern, John P.
McGrath, Milton A.
McGregor, James R.
McHenry, Milton R.
McKean, Robert A., III
McKenney, George G., Jr.
McKeown, Edward J., Jr.
McKeown, William J., Jr.
McKimens, Paul K.
McKinley, Douglas E.
McKinley, Robert N.
McKinna, Michael D.
McKinney, James B.
McKinney, John W.
McKinney, Kenneth W.
McLaughlin, James A.
McLean, James R., Jr.
Mason, John H.
McManus, Arthur T.
McMurray, Marquis E.
McNabb, John M.
McNaughton, William E.
McNee, Malcolm R.
McNew, Clyde E., Jr.
McPherson, Willard W.
McQualg, Clarence M.
Meadows, Jackie W.
Means, Michael G.
Meady, Ronald R.
Medaris, William W.
Meek, William A. J.
Meeker, Harold L.
Meeks, Joseph R.
Megill, Thomas L.
Mehl, Henry T.
Mehl, Wayne J.
Meier, George E.
Meinicke, Thomas A.
Mellott, Harlan B.
Mendenhall, Robert L.
Meng, William F.
Mengason, James
Menikheim, Douglas K.
Mercer, Benjamin F., III
Meredith, Richard B.
Meritt, Donald L.
Mermagen, Peter J.
Merrick, Martin P.
Merrill, Michael H.
Mervine, Lowrie R.
Meyer, Robert A.
Michael, Glen R.
Michaels, Albert M.
Michalski, Louis, Jr.
Michel, Alan E.
Midas, Michael T., Jr.
Miles, Samuel A., II
Millar, Robert L.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Leon R.
Miller, Phil A.
Miller, Robert B.
Miller, William E., Jr.
Milligan, Frank T.
Milliken, John N., Jr.
Million, Edwin F., Jr.
Mills, Richard B.
Millsaps, Richard Z.
Milne, Douglas S.
Mims, Norman W., Jr.
Mims, William J.
Minugh, Edward M.
Mishler, Douglas L.
Misuna, Charles W.
Mitchell, Frederick G.
Mitchell, Paul J.
Mitchell, William A.
Moerdyk, Bernard N.
Moerschel, David C.
Moller, Arthur E., Jr.
Moller, Herman W.

- Montague, Gerald F.
 Montanaro, Joseph A.
 Montgomery, David R.
 Moon, Charlie M.
 Moore, David K.
 Moore, Dennis A.
 Moore, Durward E., Jr.
 Moore, James L., Jr.
 Moore, James E.
 Moore, John A.
 Moore, Lawrence B.
 Moore, Walter B.
 Moore, William F.
 Moore, William R.
 Moorehead, William S.
 Moot, Zane A.
 Morales, Alfonso H.
 Moran, Maurice J.
 Morgan, Harold R.
 Morgan, Morris
 Morris, Carl M.
 Morris, Clarence A., Jr.
 Morris, John E.
 Morris, Lewis L.
 Morris, Robert, III
 Morris, Robert C.
 Morris, Thomas V.
 Morrison, Richard
 Morrison, Robert H.
 Morrissey, Jon E.
 Morrow, Frederic I.
 Moscoe, Loren J.
 Mosher, Andrew C.
 Mosher, Francis E.
 Moss, Ambler H., Jr.
 Mrazik, Albert
 Mucha, Marvin F.
 Muckenthaler, John L.
 Mudd, Richard L.
 Mulhearn, Raymond R.
 Mumford, Stanley E.
 Munck, Philip L.
 Munger, Francis X.
 Munroe, Frank A., III
 Murdock, Charles D.
 Murphy, Howard L.
 Murphy, Michael L.
 Murray, Allan W.
 Murray, Arthur P.
 Murray, Francis H.
 Murray, Joseph A., Jr.
 Murray, Roger P.
 Musser, Benjamin C.
 Mussman, Edward J.
 Mustard, James D.
 Myers, George C., Jr.
 Myers, Michael P.
 Naab, Geoffrey
 Nagel, David J.
 Nagle, Charles L.
 Nanney, Robert G.
 Nantau, Norman B.
 Neal, James J.
 Neapolitan, Richard C.
 Neary, Joseph P., Jr.
 Neblett, Robert E.
 Neef, James V.
 Neff, Rupert T.
 Neher, John D.
 Neifert, Donald L.
 Neill, William S.
 Neiman, Howard A.
 Nelson, Francis E.
 Nelson, George A.
 Nelson, Gerald A.
 Nelson, James R.
 Nelson, Norman R.
 Nelson, Roger W.
 Nelson, Stuart N. M.
 Nelson, Victor L.
 Nemcosky, Martin J., Jr.
 Nesbitt, Robert C., Jr.
 Nesmith, Raymond C.
 Nester, Irvin C.
 Newman, Donald W.
 Newman, Jack G.
 Newton, Winston P.
 Niccum, Leonard G.
 Nichols, Herschel C.
 Nichols, Keith A.
 Nichols, Roger A.
 Nickerson, Charles A.
 Niederer, Robert A.
 Nitschke, Richard N.
 Nixon, Murray C.
 Noland, Robert F.
 Nordwall, Curtis C.
 Norman, Robert A.
 Norman, Sheldon
 Norris, Kay L.
 Northrup, Russell L.
 Norton, Paul S.
 Novak, Harlan W.
 Novotney, Clayton L.
 Noyes, Arthur L.
 Nuernberger, Herbert C.
 Nugent, Leonard J.
 Nunez, Samuel
 Nunn, James L.
 Nystrom, Robert E.
 Oates, Kenneth L.
 Oberlander, Clifford C.
 Oberson, Herbert B.
 O'Brien, Frederick
 O'Brien, George D., Jr.
 O'Brien, Gerald H.
 O'Brien, James E.
 O'Brien, Thomas
 O'Brien, Thomas P.
 O'Brien, Ward J.
 Odell, Ralph V.
 Odom, "J" "W"
 O'Donnell, Francis X.
 Ogles, Homer C.
 Oldfather, Daniel O.
 Oliver, Chester F.
 Olney, Warren M., Jr.
 Olsen, William P.
 Olson, Donald L.
 Olson, Leray
 O'Malley, John P.
 O'Neill, Edward J., Jr.
 Oney, Warren W.
 Orbish, Vincent A.
 Ortengren, Ralph W., Jr.
 Ortleib, Alfred A.
 Ortman, John C.
 Osborne, John B.
 Oshell, Walter E.
 Otis, Howard L.
 Otis, John W.
 Ott, Keith M.
 Otte, Walter H.
 Otto, Albert C., Jr.
 Ouellette, Thomas A.
 Overstrom, Ronald G.
 Owen, Tommie J.
 Owens, Bruce H.
 Owenson, Alfred T.
 Ownby, James F.
 Pace, Joseph L.
 Padgett, James A.
 Padilla, Nicholas S.
 Paletta, Joseph, Jr.
 Palmer, Walla R., Jr.
 Pankratz, John M.
 Panshin, Daniel A.
 Papa, Henry W.
 Parcels, Paul W.
 Paris, Robert L.
 Pariseau, Richard R.
 Park, Earl P.
 Parker, Carl K.
 Parker, Charles S.
 Parker, Joseph W., Jr.
 Parker, William H.
 Parkinson, David L.
 Parlette, William T.
 Parrish, Hubert N.
 Parry, Ira E., Jr.
 Parsons, Edwin F., Jr.
 Pastre, Robert L.
 Pateas, Theodore N.
 Paterson, Robert W.
 Patterson, Donald D.
 Patterson, Bradford H.
 Patterson, John W.
 Patton, Edward J.
 Patton, James H., Jr.
 Paul, Martin A.
 Paul, Michael F.
 Paul, Raymond H.
 Paules, Granville E., III
 Paulsen, Thomas D.
 Paoule, Alvin H.
 Payne, William C.
 Peace, William H., III
 Pearce, Robert G.
 Pearl, Vincent J.
 Pearsall, Nelson H.
 Pecor, Glenn O.
 Peden, Joe D.
 Peebles, Robert H.
 Peek, Joseph H.
 Peigh, Carl
 Pellegrini, Charles A.
 Peltier, George A., Jr.
 Pendleton, Reid, Jr.
 Penner, Vernon D.
 Perkins, Richard A.
 Perrinello, Louis F.
 Perron, Joseph H.
 Perry, Elmer L., Jr.
 Perry, Lyman S. A.
 Peters, Donald L.
 Peters, James F., Jr.
 Peters, Thomas J.
 Petersen, Peter M.
 Petersen, Ted M.
 Peterson, Charles H.
 Peterson, Donald L.
 Peterson, Ernest K.
 Peterson, Harold A.
 Peterson, Richard N.
 Pethick, John A., II
 Petrie, Arthur B.
 Petrilla, John A.
 Petrovitz, George, Jr.
 Petty, Benny M.
 Pezet, Walter A., III
 Pfleckl, Louis W.
 Pfouts, John P.
 Phelan, James E.
 Phelps, Harold R., Jr.
 Pheister, Larry L.
 Philbrick, James W., Jr.
 Philhower, Peter P.
 Phillipps, Peter M.
 Phillippi, Frederick E., Jr.
 Phillips, Grady H.
 Phillips, George B.
 Phillips, Glen R.
 Phillips, Henry L., Jr.
 Phillips, Robert W.
 Phipps, Rodney G.
 Picard, Joseph C. E.
 Pich, Leo
 Piech, Henry J.
 Pike, Robert P., Jr.
 Pilcher, Charles E.
 Pilkenton, Hester R.
 Pimm, Russell S.
 Pippen, Merrill D.
 Pirtz, Ronald B.
 Pitt, William M.
 Pittelli, Robert J.
 Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
 Ploeger, Paul H., III
 Plummer, Grant W.
 Pochordo, Stanley
 Poindexter, Chris H.
 Polaski, Harold E., Jr.
 Pommer, Edward P.
 Pomrehn, Hugo P.
 Ponton, Melvin V.
 Pool, Herman M.
 Pope, David K.
 Poppert, William R.
 Porter, Donald J.
 Porter, Ethan O., Jr.
 Porter, William M.
 Porter, William J.
 Potter, Robert A.
 Potter, Roderick H.
 Powell, George A.
 Powell, William L., Jr.
 Powell, William B.
 Powers, Byron L., Jr.
 Powers, Harvey R.
 Powers, Robert C.
 Powers, Robert J.
 Prater, Donald C.
 Prather, James T.
 Pratt, George W.
 Pratt, Joel S.
 Pratt, Marvin J.
 Prebola, George J.
 Presley, Thomas M.
 Price, Gary J.
 Price, Harold R.
 Prince, Robert V.
 Prohaska, Frank B.
 Provaznik, Clarence E.
 Prueske, Elmer W.
 Puckett, Nathan L.
 Pugh, John S.
 Pullen, Leonard A.
 Purcell, William C.
 Purl, John D.
 Purpura, Frank F.
 Purse, John J.
 Purtee, Jack W.
 Qualls, Fred H.
 Quarterman, Joseph L., Jr.
 Quinn, Jack C.
 Quinn, Joseph S.
 Rader, Keith E.
 Raftis, Paul E.
 Ragsdale, George L.
 Raines, Paul E.
 Rains, Donald R.
 Rakiewicz, Theodore W., Jr.
 Ramsey, James B.
 Ramsey, William F.
 Ransom, Edward A.
 Raph, Merlyn F.
 Rathbun, Dennis K.
 Ravetta, Richard C.
 Ray, Harry, Jr.
 Rayburn, Clarence W.
 Raymond, David A.
 Raymond, Henry A.
 Raymond, Robert W.
 Read, Gustavus C., Jr.
 Reck, Richard L.
 Redman, Charles D.
 Reed, Joseph W.
 Reed, Richard D.
 Reed, Ross M.
 Reeder, Hugh A.
 Rees, Richard J.
 Reese, Evan P.
 Reese, Ronald M.
 Regan, James J., Jr.
 Regner, Clarence H., Jr.
 Reich, Harry B.
 Reichle, Philip S.
 Reightler, Kenneth S.
 Reintert, Herbert W.
 Reinholdt, Theodore L.
 Reinstra, Llewellyn R.
 Reisenleiter, Vernon A., Jr.
 Remakis, John, Jr.
 Remenak, Leo N., Jr.
 Renner, Robert R.
 Renning, Richard A.
 Reno, Andrew F.
 Repine, Marlin D.
 Repp, John T.
 Ressler, Paul M.
 Reuter, Stewart E.
 Reynolds, Dexter H., Jr.
 Reynolds, James C.
 Rhinebeck, George C.
 Rhinebolt, Henry J.
 Rhodes, Forrest T.
 Rhodes, Melton E., Jr.
 Rhodes, Robert M.
 Rhodes, William A.
 Rice, Robert P.
 Rice, William R.
 Richards, Frank M.
 Richardson, John M., Jr.
 Richardson, Thomas J.
 Richardson, Bruce R.
 Richartz, Arthur O.
 Richey, Howard L.
 Rickelman, John H.
 Ridder, Wendell C.
 Riden, Harold W.
 Riehm, Charles E., Jr.
 Riggs, Harold S.
 Riggs, William D.
 Rliff, Francis J.
 Riley, Harold P.
 Riley, John T.
 Riley, Roy G.
 Rimelen, Harry J.
 Riner, Robert E.
 Rinnert, Henry J.
 Ritchie, Lloyd T.
 Roark, William M.
 Robbins, Albert H.
 Roberson, Franklin P.
 Roberts, Charles K.
 Roberts, Donald A.
 Roberts, Ernest P.
 Roberts, Lawrence W.
 Roberts, Richard R.
 Robertson, Teddie E.
 Robertson, Delmaine A.
 Robertson, James F., Jr.
 Robins, Thomas D.
 Robinson, Marion B.
 Robinson, Richard E.
 Robinson, William B.
 Roche, James G.
 Rodgers, William E. L.
 Rodriguez, Antonio B.
 Roeder, Bernard F., Jr.
 Roemish, Eric M.
 Rogers, George R.
 Rogers, John L.
 Rogers, Roy L.
 Rognlien, Robert P.
 Rohr, Edwin M.
 Rohr, Robert C.
 Roller, Donald G.
 Rollins, David J.
 Rolph, Kenneth E.
 Romanelli, John N.
 Rooney, Henry F.
 Roop, Charles W.
 Roper, Lidge B.
 Roselle, Curtis C.
 Rosenberg, Herman E.
 Rosengren, Joseph R.
 Ross, Robert W.
 Ross, William M., Jr.
 Ross, William W.
 Roth, Daniel McK.
 Rothschild, Stephen G.
 Rothschild, Robert E.
 Roudebush, Jackie L.
 Rouse, William A.
 Routt, William, Jr.
 Rowan, Charles L.
 Rowland, Robert C.
 Rowley, James E.
 Ruckersfeldt, George E.
 Rudy, George H., III
 Ruhsenberger, John F.
 Runnels, James M.
 Rupert, Clarence W.
 Russell, James H.
 Russell, William R.
 Russick, John A.
 Rutherford, Robert R.
 Ryan, Kevin T.
 Ryan, Larry E.
 Ryan, Lester E.
 Ryder, Albert
 Saari, Colin H.
 Salesky, Theodore E.
 Sanderlin, Francis R.
 Sanders, Donald W.
 Sanders, Gilbert E.
 Sanders, Loren L.
 Sanders, Ralph G.
 Sanders, William E.
 Sanford, Harold W.
 Sargent, Elbert W.
 Sarno, Lawrence F.
 Sasser, Sidney J.
 Saunders, Franklin H.
 Savage, Kenneth D.
 Sawyer, Harmon W.
 Sawyer, John L.
 Scaif, Fred R., Jr.
 Schaefer, Joseph F., Jr.
 Schappaugh, Earl L.
 Schardein, Edgar A.
 Schisler, Billy W.
 Schlicht, Donald L.
 Schmeltz, Victor C., Jr.
 Schmer, Conrad J., Jr.
 Schmidt, John A.
 Schneider, George T.
 Schneider, George F.
 Schneider, Robert P.
 Schoonover, Ray R.
 Schriefer, Luther F.
 Schroeder, William A., III
 Schroeder, Raymond C., Jr.
 Schuette, Richard W.
 Schult, Richard W.
 Schultz, James F.
 Schultz, William V.
 Schultz, Willard E.
 Schulz, Robert J.
 Schuman, Stanley D.
 Schutte, Frank A.
 Schweizer, Earle G., Jr.
 Schwer, Frederick A., Jr.
 Scott, Charles T.
 Scott, James H.
 Scott, Johnnie W.
 Scott, John R.
 Scott, Thomas W.
 Scoville, Frederick W.
 Scruggs, Sidney L., III
 Scully, Vincent F., Jr.
 Seale, Eugene B.
 Seaman, Stewart R.
 Seebirt, James E.
 Seekell, Warren W.
 Seelen, Charles
 Seeley, Howard G.
 Seiden, Paul E.
 Sellers, William E.
 Senhen, Linus A.
 Serfass, Robert E.
 Sessions, Thomas F., II
 Sestric, Joseph L.
 Sevario, Byron W.
 Shaffer, John G.
 Shaffer, Phillip H.
 Shanley, Peter A.
 Shanok, Michael E.
 Sharp, Grant A.
 Sharp, John B., Jr.
 Sharp, Perry C.
 Shattuck, Oliver P.
 Shaw, Joe L.
 Shaw, John F.
 Shawkey, Richard S.
 Shawver, John R.
 Shea, Brian M.
 Sheehan, Robert P.
 Sheler, James A.
 Sheppard, Alfred D.
 Sherman, Howard E.
 Sherman, John M.
 Sherron, Cole A.
 Sherwood, Raymond W.

- Shindielecker, John B.
Shipp, Jimmie S.
Shirk, Robert L., Jr.
Shoemaker, Brian H.
Shoemaker, Hugh L.
Short, Richard H.
Shovlin, Daniel M.
Shreckengast, James A.
Shufelt, William J., Jr.
Shuford, Robert E.
Shumake, George E.
Shumway, Louis A.
Shy, Julius T.
Siebecke, Alfred G.
Siepel, Willard E.
Slevers, Arthur W.
Simms, Gordon H.
Simonelli, Norman W.
Simons, Charles F., Jr.
Simpson, Frank T.
Simpson, Harold L., Jr.
Singer, Arnold
Singleton, "J" Arthur
Sipple, Howard L., Jr.
Sisk, Ralph D.
Skidgel, Gerald T.
Skillin, Kenneth W.
Skillman, John W.
Slack, Charles E., III
Slagg, Lyle L., Jr.
Sleeper, Joseph E.
Slezak, Norman L.
Slick, Charles O.
Slobodny, Joseph J.
Smiley, Robert W.
Smith, Billie J.
Smith, Clyde W.
Smith, David W.
Smith, Donald A.
Smith, Edgar N.
Smith, Fairfax J.
Smith, Frank R.
Smith, George E., Jr.
Smith, George R.
Smith, Glenn H.
Smith, Hugh J., Jr.
Smith, "J" "B"
Smith, Jackson E. M.
Smith, James A. D.
Smith, John F.
Smith, John N.
Smith, Kenneth L.
Smith, Larry L.
Smith, Lowell E.
Smith, Peter D.
Smith, Peter H.
Smith, Ray W.
Smith, Regis E.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert W.
Smith, Ronald C.
Smith, Roy C., IV
Smith, Thomas D.
Smith, Vance G.
Smithson, Alva P.
Smits, Walter I.
Snell, Wendell D.
Snodgrass, Roger R.
Snow, Charles H., Jr.
Snow, Richard M.
Snyder, Robert W.
Snyder, Stanley G.
Soderholm, Loren F. G.
Sokolowski, Steven
Sollberger, Melvin H.
Sollenberger, Robert N.
Soper, Edward E.
Sordelet, James E.
Sorenson, Loren O.
Sortor, James B.
Souval, Paul T.
Sovey, Paul L.
Sowell, Harley A., Jr.
Spang, Norman W.
Spann, Alton B.
- Sparks, Ernest E.
Sparks, Paul W.
Spearman, William R.
Speegle, Arthur R.
Spencer, Edmund B.
Sperling, Harris
Sperry, Siefert T.
Spidell, Everett D.
Spiker, Donald C.
Spinelli, Domenick A., Jr.
Spinks, Alfred H.
Spriggs, Harold B.
Spurr, Gilbert C.
Stabler David R., Jr.
Stack, James F.
Staes, James P.
Staley, Wayne E.
Stalnaker, Frank
Stamer, Leonard P.
Stampfie, Richard A., Jr.
Standard, Louis F.
Standley, John R.
Stanley, Bolling C., Jr.
Stanley, Howard C.
Stanley, Joe M., Jr.
Stanley, William M.
Stansell, John A.
Starling, Frank E.
Stasko, Nicholas J.
Stauch, Eugene A.
Steedley, Duncan M.
Steele, Robert L.
Steelhead, Wesley L.
Stefencavage, George
Steffens, Marcellus P.
Steiner, Duane R.
Stenson, Henry B.
Stephens, Darrel L.
Stephens, Manuel C.
Stevens, Stanley L.
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, Glendale P.
Stewart, Harvey T., Jr.
Stewart, Kelsey S.
Stewart, Richard L.
Stewart, William J.
Stine, Clarence E.
St. Jean, Russell J.
Stoakley, Richard H.
Stoehel, Robert E.
Stokes, Thomas M.
Stoltz, Charles L.
Storms, James J.
Story, Hardin C.
Stott, Joe M.
Strangerhosen, Rolf
Stratton, Bobbie E.
Straughn, Wyatt F.
Strawbridge, David A.
Striedel, Henry C.
Struck, Gerald L. V.
Strunk, Alvin A.
Stryker, Lylal M.
Stuart, Walter A.
Stumbo, Stanley C.
Sturm, Edward J.
Sturm, Harold F., Jr.
Suddath, Jewel J., Jr.
Suggs, Robert F.
Sullivan, Francis E.
Sullivan, George E., III
Sullivan, John F.
Sullivan, James E., Jr.
Sullivan, Patrick H.
Supek, Louis R.
Super, Richard N.
Surber, John S., Jr.
Surprenant, John P.
Surratt, Jon E.
Sutcliffe, William G.
Sutliff, Robert C., Jr.
Sutor, John K.
Sutter, Henry E.
Svatek, Joseph F.
Svensen, Stanley R.
- Swap, John E.
Swearingen, Howard W.
Swilley, Aaron E.
Syck, James M.
Szczepanski, Kazimierz J.
Szeyller, Edward P.
Taber, Alton E., Jr.
Tabor, Don C.
Tackney, Peter M.
Tadlock, James D.
Taff, Dennis V.
Taipale, Denis G.
Tait, David N.
Tait, John H.
Tait, Thomas M.
Talarico, Frank
Talbot, Bruce R.
Talken, George F.
Talley, James C., Jr.
Talley, Kirby L.
Tallman, James R.
Taubee, William H.
Taylor, Clarence R.
Taylor, Donald E.
Taylor, Frank L.
Taylor, Jerry I.
Taylor, John F.
Taylor, Lloyd F.
Taylor, Lowell S.
Taylor, Nelson D.
Taylor, Raynor A. K.
Taylor, Robert G.
Taylor, Thomas W.
Taylor, Turner W.
Taylor, William E.
Teal, Thomas H., III
Teeter, Richard E.
Temple, Nicholas B.
Tereo, Michael
Terry, Charles L.
Terry, Dennis H.
Terry, Donald L.
Terry, John R.
Terry, Thomas J., Jr.
Tew, Jasper L.
Thames, Lewis H., Jr.
Thibeault, Frederick L.
Thomas, Carlyle J.
Thomas, Christopher R.
Thomas, Frank A.
Thomas, Glenn R.
Thomas, John B.
Thomas, Larry D.
Thomas, William E.
Thompson, Alton K.
Thompson, Earle A., Jr.
Thompson, James E., Jr.
Thompson, Phillip S.
Thompson, Robert E.
Thompson, Thomas N.
Thorderson, John R.
Thorgerson, Eric J.
Thornburgh, Eldon L.
Thorner, Michael G.
Thumser, William D.
Tilton, Donald A.
Timm, Leroy A.
Tisdale, Jesse W.
Tobin, Kiefer A.
Todd, William D.
Tolderlund, Douglas S.
Tollaksen, Duane M.
Tomkins, Harold L.
Tomkins, Norman E.
Toms, Malcolm E.
Tool, Stephen R.
Toomer, Garland W.
Topp, David P.
Torrance, Harold S.
Tourney, Keith M.
Towle, Robert L.
Townsend, William J.
Trainor, John J.
- Trainor, Walter C.
Traister, Robert E.
Tranchini, Joseph
Trapp, Nathan L.
Travis, Bevan E.
Treacy, Michael F.
Trefry, Edwin V.
Treseder, Richard M.
Trimble, David C.
Triptow, Earl L., II
Tritz, Lawrence J.
Troyer, Thomas L.
Trudeau, Frank F.
Truesdell, William M.
Truitt, Richard D.
Tucker, Robert E., Jr.
Tullis, Robert D.
Tully, Neal C.
Tully, Vernon C., Jr.
Tumminelli, Joseph P.
Tupaz, Jesus B.
Tupaz, Terencio
Turk, Eugene J.
Turner, Ellis L.
Turner, Rolland R.
Tuttobene, Anthony T.
Tyler, Donald K.
Tyson, James P.
Uhrhane, Francis J.
Valk, Jerome W.
VanAuken, Ivan E., Jr.
VandenBroeck, Thomas A.
VanderVort, Harry E., Jr.
VanHouten, Otis E.
VanHynning, Carl W.
VanNess, Peter R.
Varley, Edwin R., Jr.
Varner, Dale N.
Vaughn, William E.
Vaught, Clarence T.
Vawter, Vernon J.
Veazey, Luther T.
Verona, Francis M.
Verwers, Robert A.
Vest, Calvin L.
Vied, Dennis H.
Vincent, James M.
Virden, Charles S.
Vivian, Jack A.
Vogels, Richard H.
VonFischer, Eduard L., III
VonKleeck, John S., Jr.
VonKolnitz, Henry, Jr.
Voss, George P.
Vrtar, Marko
Waddell, Robert M.
Wade, Joseph W., Jr.
Wagenbrenner, Blase P.
Wagner, Alfred H., Jr.
Wagner, Edward F.
Wagner, Fred D.
Wagner, Theodore
Walker, Arthur J.
Walker, Charles E.
Walker, Edward T., Jr.
Walker, George R., Jr.
Walker, Horace G.
Walker, Wilburn O.
Walker, William H.
Wall, Edward J.
Wall, Thomas E.
Wallace, George L.
Walls, James M.
Walsh, George A., Jr.
Walsh, Patrick A.
Walter, Everett R.
Walters, Horace M., Jr.
Walters, Robert M.
Wangeman, Charles E., Jr.
Wangler, John H.
Ward, Gordon L.
Ward, Sibley L., III
- Wardle, Norval L.
Ware, Paul N.
Warren, Robert R.
Warren, Robert S.
Warren, Roger C.
Waterman, Larry W.
Watilo, Kenneth E.
Watkins, Donald E.
Watkins, James
Watrous, David
Watson, James D.
Watson, John W.
Watson, Louis H.
Watt, Robert H.
Watts, Donald W.
Wax, Gary N.
Weatherspoon, Joseph R.
Weaver, Milton W.
Webb, Lowell E.
Webb, Paul H.
Weber, Daniel D.
Weeks, George R., Jr.
Wegele, Edward
Wegner, Arthur E.
Weichman, Bruce E.
Weinhardt, William J.
Weir, Glendon H.
Weisenberger, Frederick P.
Welch, Walter E.
Welenc, Joseph
Wendholt, Gregory W.
Wentzel, Richard D.
Wenyon, Leonard J.
Wert, Peter Karl W.
Wertman, Franklin, Jr.
Westbrook, John F.
Westerman, John P.
Westover, Richard L.
Weymouth, Charles R.
Whalen, Joseph M., II
Wheeler, Donald R.
Wheeler, Donald C.
Wheeler, Raymond M.
Wheeler, William W., Jr.
Whelan, John F., Jr.
White, George E.
White, Lawrence W.
White, Marshall N.
White, Richard J.
White, Robert D.
White, Thomas L., Jr.
White, Thomas O., Jr.
Whitehead, Charles T.
Whitely, John E., Jr.
Whiteman, William E.
Whittington, William J.
Whittington, William O.
Whittle, Delma H., Jr.
Wichman, James H.
Wigfall, George H., Jr.
Wiggins, Jack
Wightman, James E.
Wilbur, Paul J.
Wilcox, Emory E.
Wilcox, Loran A.
Wilcox, Wayland E.
Wiley, Edwin H.
Wiley, Talmadge K.
Wilgenbusch, Ronald C.
Willenbacher, Marshall R.
Willey, Marshall L.
Willey, Percy W., Jr.
Williams, Albert L.
Williams, Bryce W.
Williams, Clarence R.
Williams, Douglas A.
Williams, Dallas K.
Williams, Eysel M.
Williams, Hugh T.
Williams, John R.
Williams, John D.
Williams, James W.
Williams, Johnny L.
Williams, Morris B.
- Williams, Walter L.
Williams, Zane G.
Williamson, James V., Jr.
Williamson, Charles B.
Willsey, John M.
Wilson, Ashley V.
Wilson, Donald M.
Wilson, Edward A.
Wilson, James R.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, Richard E.
Wilson, Richard V.
Wilson, Robert A.
Wilson, Seth T., Jr.
Wilson, Thomas E., Jr.
Wilson, Waldo W.
Wilson, William O.
Wimberly, William E.
Winarski, Daniel A.
Winkle, Arthur D., Jr.
Winston, Richard J.
Winters, Collin G.
Wise, Donald R.
Wishart, Thomas T.
Witcher, Murray H., Jr.
Witt, James D., Jr.
Witten, John W.
Witzke, Arnold E.
Wolfe, James B.
Wolfgram, James K.
Wolod, William A.
Wolverton, Donnie R.
Wombold, Arthur D.
Wonnell, Stanley E.
Wood, James E.
Wood, Leslie E.
Woodall, Jere W.
Woodaman, Ronald E.
Woodard, John S.
Woodbury, David E.
Woodruff, Frank C.
Woodruff, Harold H.
Woods, Leonard W.
Woods, Philip J.
Woodward, Albert J.
Woodward, Frank, Jr.
Woodward, John D.
Worden, Douglas W.
Worley, Loren
Worley, William F.
Worth, Charles W.
Worthington, Fred V.
Worthington, James T.
Wren, Robert P.
Wright, Hendon O.
Wright, Robert W.
Wright, William C.
Wright, William E.
Wubenhorst, Richard F.
Wynn, Alvin D.
Wynn, Hugh J.
Wyse, William J.
Yarber, Gene
Yarborough, Paul E.
Yeager, Dale A.
Yelinek, William A.
Yeske, Lanny A.
Yocher, Edward H.
Youmans, Edwin E.
Young, Charles T.
Young, Frederick J., Jr.
Young, John R.
Young, Richard K.
Zak, Eugene A.
Zang, Robert L.
Zari, Albert B.
Zeller, Raymond G.
Ziemkowski, Gerald J.
Zerden, William E.
Zimmerman, William C.
Zmorzenski, Frank P.
Zumwalde, Richard T.
Zurich, Richard W.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

IN THE NAVY

LINE

Abel, Jon F.
Byrnes, Joseph L.
Danner, John C.
Hill, Ronald V.
Murray, Edward P.
Osborough, Harry R.
Sandidge, Edward D.
Shewchuk, Jon D.
Bennett, Donald M.
Burnette, Mark I., Jr.
Butts, Maurice R.
Donahue, Charles P.
Landers, Edward J.
Lynch, Frederick W.
Mitchell, Robert E., Jr.
Scoggin, James M.
White, Bernard G.
Wiese, Richard J.
Wilson, Leon D.
Wright, Lindell W.
Cain, Richard L.
Jones, Wayne A.
Leahy, William F., Jr.
Mears, Ronald T.
Painter, Floyd C.
Quinn, Michael E.
Russell, Jerry C.
Smith, Clyde C., Jr.
Smith, Earle L., Jr.
Walker, Wallace H.
Cheshire, Leonard P., Jr.
Dalrymple, John R., Jr.
Holtel, Kenneth P.
Johnson, Robert A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Barry, George H., Jr.
Billeter, Paul R.
Butler, Paul K.
Collette, Royal G. C.
Copeland, Stuart W.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Pitcher, William F.
Struthers, Lynn C.

NURSE CORPS

Frolio, "M" Ellen

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Calhoun, William B., III
Chappelaine, Jerrold E.
Coleman, Richard F.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bond, Hollis H.
Edwards, John R., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Edwards, Donna J.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Kenneth R. Adams, Jr.
Anthony J. Adaschik
Michael R. Addison
Hugh M. Alexander
Henry D. Allen
Gunter Amtmann
Andrew G. Anderson, Jr.
Cecil C. Anderson

Daniel S. Anderson
David C. Anderson
Dixon J. Anderson
Thomas P. Anderson
John P. Angell
Gary E. Angerhofer
Lester A. Apple
Stephen S. Applegate
Marc T. Apter
James D. Arterburn

Brian P. Atkinson
Sid E. Atkinson
David C. Atwater
Lawrence J. Baack
Donald J. Baird
*Richard B. Bakewell
George K. Baldwin
James H. Ball
Robert C. Ballenger
Warren M. Banks
Nicholas T. Bard, Jr.
George H. Bare
Kenneth D. Barker
William J. Barksdale
Dennis R. Barnhart
Richard A. Bates
Alan E. Baumrucker
George G. Baxter III
Richard D. Becker
Michael E. Beckes
Ted Beckwith, Jr.
Robert A. Berdine
Peter W. Berg
Carl R. Berman, Jr.
Stephen M. Bernstein
Donald T. Berry
James E. Biddle
Theodore J. Bielen, Jr.
David L. Bintingier
Francis M. Black, Jr.
Bert E. Blackwell
Jack R. Blair
Donald R. Blakely
George A. Bleyle, Jr.
Wayne A. Boatman
Donald L. Boggs
Craig G. Bonesteel
Louis J. Boos
Carl B. Borchers
*Walter C. Borman
James S. Borona
John D. Bourdo
Charles A. Bourn
Robert W. Boyce
Bruce J. Boydell
James L. Boydston
Bruce A. Boyer
Francis X. Boylan, Jr.
Timothy S. Brady
William E. Bragunier
Harry B. Brandon III
Craig M. Brandt
Robert A. Bransford, Jr.
Hugh E. Brazill
Alan F. Breininger
James L. Brewer
Jeffrey Bricker
Larry L. Bright
Albert R. Brittain, Jr.
Ronald M. Brittain
Earl B. Brookbank III
Donald C. Bross
James A. Brown
Jeffrey L. Brown
Lawrence O. Brown
Robert P. Brown
David L. Browne
Brooks Bucher
William F. Buckley
Winston P. Bullard
Andrew L. Burgess, Jr.
David S. Burr
James F. Byrne
David W. Cable
Joseph F. Cahill, Jr.
Ray L. Caldwell
Laurence A. Callahan
Leonard P. Callahan
Michael W. Callahan
William E. Cameron, Jr.
William T. Cameron, Jr.
John A. Campbell, Jr.
Malcolm L. Campbell
James R. Carey
Richard S. Carey
Thomas K. Carroll, Jr.
William F. Case
Alan M. Cashman

Byron M. Cavaney, Jr.
Arthur K. Cebrowski
John E. Chadwick, Jr.
Alfred P. Chambliss III
Joseph J. Chappell, Jr.
Anthony W. Charlton
Paul R. Charron
Peter T. Chiodo
Charles J. Chotvacs
William P. Christie
Raymond Cinco, Jr.
Paul A. Ciotti
John C. Clary
Kenneth E. Clemens
Halbert R. Cliff
Michael L. Cline
Clarence H. Clover, Jr.
Richard S. Cloward
Clarence D. Coburn, Jr.
Edward C. Coffey
Walter S. Collins
Andrew J. Combe
Michael S. Confer
Michael Conlin
Dale M. Content
Paul A. Conterno
Douglas W. Cook
John B. Cooper, Jr.
Thomas M. Corwin
Maurice W. Coulon
Martin C. Coyne
Robert C. Cross, Jr.
Edward M. Crosson, Jr.
Lionel Crowley
Paul A. Croy
David W. Curry
George L. Custodi
Robert E. Curtis
James Allan Davis
James Alvin Davis
James W. Davis, Jr.
Ralph R. Davis
James R. Day, Jr.
Richard C. Dearmond, Jr.
Donald D. Delmanzo, Jr.
Robert A. Delorenzo
Joseph G. Demarco, Jr.
Philip W. Dempewolf
William R. Denslow, Jr.
Jerome L. Devilbiss
Richard W. Dewey
James T. Dewing, Jr.
Robert P. Dillman
Brian D. Dillon
Henry M. Dodd, Jr.
Michael W. Doyle
James L. Dozier, Jr.
Dennis G. Draper
Raymond M. Drew
Carl H. Dreyer
David R. Drinan
Mitchell O. Driskell, Jr.
Snowden C. Dubois
Jerry M. Dunagan
John L. Earle
Jerry C. Ebersbaker
George L. Edgar
Julian D. Edge, Jr.
Leslie S. Edmondson
Harry S. Edwards, Jr.
Henry B. Edwards, Jr.
John N. Edwards
Theodore J. Ehlers
Richard W. Elliott
John M. Emerson
James D. Ennis
Richard A. Epperly
Robert F. Erdman, Jr.
Clifford M. Erickson
Paul F. Erickson
George F. Erwin
John W. Essig
Peter J. Eversole
James J. Evans
David L. Eustis

Larry A. Evans
Robert L. Ewing
William H. Ewing, Jr.
Frank J. Fabre, Jr.
Richard T. Fagan
Glenn E. Fant, Jr.
Claude S. Farmer, Jr.
Michael J. Farmer
David W. Farrar
Stephen A. Fausett
James J. Feder
Michael A. Ferrara
Charles D. Feustel
Everett E. Fine
Joel R. Fitts
John W. H. Fitzgerald
Thomas R. Fletcher
Ernest H. Forman
Gary L. Forsberg
John B. Foster III
Thomas A. Frame
Carl L. Frederick
William E. Free III
Charles A. French
Dennis D. Frick
Harold J. Fricke, Jr.
Jon H. Friedman
James M. Frost
Duane S. Fulkles
Joseph A. Fulmer
James L. Fulwiler
John E. Furrow
James A. Gabala
Arlan D. Gadeken
Thomas A. Gaither
Gaylord W. Galther
Robert M. Gallen
James C. Gamrath
Wilmer C. Gangloff, Jr.
Mark E. Garrett
Tom S. Garrison
Michael W. Gaupin
John C. Gawne
Marvin J. Gay
John M. Geddie, Jr.
John W. Gemmill
Gary L. Genson
Larry F. Germann
Donald W. Getts
George J. Gides
Edwin F. Gler
Michael J. Gigl
James J. Gildea
Gary D. Giller
Ronald J. Gilles
James G. Gilmour
Robert P. Gilpin
Frederick T. Glison, Jr.
Eugene H. Ginchereau
David M. Gist
Clarence H. Glover, Jr.
Charles W. Gnilka
Jerome L. Gogat
Gerald L. Good
Barry A. Gordon
Robert P. Gordon
Robert L. Gorham
Peter J. Graef
James J. Graham
Richard D. Graham
Stephen I. Grant
John C. Graves III
Kenneth E. Graves
Daniel E. Green
William F. Green
James B. Greene
Alan R. Greenwood
George W. Grier III
Harry A. Guess
Richard Guglielmino
James E. Gutierrez
Joseph R. Hackett
Ronald S. Hadbavny
Donald H. Haight
Edward T. Hallahan, Jr.
James W. Hambleton
Gerald K. Hamilton

Howard H. Hamilton
Mark I. Hampton
Richard E. Hansel
Robert T. Hanson, Jr.
Richard W. Hardy
Philip B. Harper
Christopher B. Harris
Stewart M. Harriss
William I. Harris
Hollis W. Harmon
Thomas R. Harter
William M. Hartman
Robert A. Hauser
Roger M. Hawk
William W. Hawke
John A. Hawley III
Kipp T. Hayes
James K. Hayward
Benny J. Heeb
William A. Heep
Philip Heidinger
David L. Heiserman
David W. Heist
Jon S. Hemming
James R. Hendricks
Owen S. Henning
Louis W. Hennings III
Robert E. Hereford, Jr.
Gerald R. Hess
David W. Heyer
Robert W. Heyer
Frederick H. Heyse
Michael F. Hewlett
George P. Hibbard
Robert P. Hickey, Jr.
John L. Hildebrandt
III
David M. Hill
Frederick W. Hillmann
Samuel H. Himes, Jr.
James E. Himmel-spach
Sidney W. Hite, Jr.
Thomas E. Hogarth
David L. Holick
Grant T. Hollett, Jr.
Merlin B. Hollinger
William H. Holme
John T. Holmes
Daniel C. Holsenbeck
John T. Holton
Thomas R. Holton
Alan K. Holzapfel
James J. Horan
Albin Horowitz
Robert B. Horton, Jr.
William V. Horton
Jonathan P. Houghton
Robert L. Houder
William D. Howey, Jr.
Howard H. Hubbard II
Phillip T. Hufford
Edward M. Hughes
Jerry M. Hultin
Gordon W. Hunter
William J. Hurd
Jerald R. Hyde
Harry W. Hydrick
Robert F. Hynes
Peter M. Igoe
John L. Ingwersen
Larry A. Irwin
Phillip W. Isaacs
Michael T. Isenberg
John P. Jannik
Paul W. Jarris
Timothy D. Jaroch
Mark D. Jarrett
Frederick A. Jenner-john
Frank J. Jerabek
Joseph J. Joerg, Jr.
Frank W. Jones
Gary P. Jones
James G. Jones
Kip E. Jones
Thomas H. Jones
Wilton S. Jones
James A. Jordan
Robert K. Julian
Lindsey E. Kalal

- Richard A. Kalyn
Michael Kampf III
Ronald C. Katahara
David O. Kauppi
James M. Kearney
Walter E. Kearns
Paul H. Keefe, Jr.
Francis M. Keim
Thomas D. Kenneally
Dennis S. Kennedy
Hugh D. Keogh
Harry D. Kerr
Joseph A. Keyes
Louis J. Kienlen
Dennis W. Kiley
Kent H. Killam
Stephen M. Kimerling
Wayne B. Kingsley
Louis F. Kirchoff, Jr.
John A. Kirkebo
Jack G. Kitchens, Jr.
William G. Kline III
Warren H. Klink
Kenneth D. Klocek
Byron P. Kloepfel
David M. Knight
Harold S. Koenig
Keith G. Koerber
Donald S. Kohla
John D. Kolata
Roy A. Kott
John M. Kozma
David L. Kranz
Michael A. Krebs
Paul B. Kurke
Richard G. Lacher
David R. Laehn
Paul W. Lagreek
James R. Lamping
Gerald T. Lang
Michael A. Lang
Kenneth J. Larsen
David R. Lartaud
Eric W. Laub
David W. Lawrence
Aaron R. Lawson
Gerald S. Lazarczyk
Francis T. Lebens
Allan R. Lee
Ronald S. Lehman
William T. Lehman
Armond C. Lepage
Laurin H. Letart
Stanley C. Lewczyk
Eben W. Lewis, Jr.
Leland G. Lewis
David J. Lherault
Donald H. Lieblich
George H. Lindsay
Ronald L. Lindsay
Sidney E. Linton
Peter L. Litrenta
Wade S. Little
John A. Loarie
Robert J. Loarie
Peter V. Locke
Stephen F. Lotterhand
Steven J. Loucks
David N. Lucas
George M. Lucas
Ronald G. Ludlow
John R. Lutz
George Lyford, Jr.
Paul R. Lyon
Thomas H. MacBain,
Jr.
Herbert M. MacDon-
ald III
Bruce A. MacFadyen
Daniel I. MacIntyre
IV
Paul J. Madigan
Leonard A. Magazine
Bruce B. Magnuson
Clarence B. Mahoney,
Jr.
Ronald L. Main
Lee S. Malrs
Richard G. Majer
Andrew A. Makowka
Richard A. Malahowski
- Phillip J. Mall
Joseph W. Manke
Alcide S. Mann, Jr.
Wayne R. Manning
Walter Marciniak, Jr.
John T. Margeson
Charles L. Marsh, Jr.
Ralph K. Martin
Theodore J. Martin
William D. Martin
Edward J. Mathias
Christopher T. Maurer
Walter L. Maurer
Joseph P. Mayer III
John R. Maynard
William C. Mayrose
James T. McCarthy
Charles K. McCoy
Francis M. McCoy, Jr.
Mike C. McCoy
Howard R. McDaniel
Robert J. McDaniel
John F. McDonald
David T. McEachen
Robert T. McGee
Barry L. McGhee
John D. McGill
Daniel J. McGrath
Michael L. McGraw
Rob R. McGregor, Jr.
Hagen B. McGuire
Scott A. McKenney
David H. McKinley
Bruce W. McLaughlin
Terrence A. McLaugh-
lin
Dana C. McLendon, Jr.
John A. McMullen
Stafford F. McNamee,
Jr.
Dale L. McPherson
William M. McWil-
liams III
Robert N. Meals, Jr.
John M. Medlock III
Grant S. Meiner
Michael A. Merback
Andrew C. Messer
Philip J. Metres, Jr.
Paul A. Metz
Walter L. Meyers
Dennis A. Michele
Thomas M. Mickelsen
John R. Mileski
John C. Miller
John R. Miller
Kent P. Miller
Michael M. Miller
Philip R. Miller
Richard L. Miller
Archibald E. Millis, Jr.
John O. Miner, Jr.
Gordon L. Mitchell
William R. Mitchum
III
Karl F. Mohns
Robert J. Moir
Frank J. Monahan
Steven M. Mondul
Philip R. Monroe
John D. Monticello
Arl Van Moore, Jr.
Kenneth J. Moore
Richard A. Moore
Harry E. Morgan
David N. Morris
Willard W. Morris
James L. Morse
Donald L. Moseley
Benjamin M. Moyer,
Jr.
James W. Mulholland
John B. Mulligan, Jr.
Thomas D. Munsch
George J. Murphy
William H. Murphy,
III
Phillips S. Murray
Terry D. Murray
Michael A. Nave
Evan A. Neff, Jr.
- Richard G. Nelson
David C. Neubauer
Marino J. Niccolai
Douglas R. Nichols
Larry A. Nichols
Michael Nickelsburg
Frank J. Nivert
Robert M. Noah
Ernest J. Notar
Harold L. Novick
James E. Novitzki
Herbert D. Nowlin, Jr.
Dwight E. Nunn, Jr.
Lawrence M. O'Connor
Richard D. O'Connor
Douglas A. Oglesby
Theodore T. Okasin-
ski
Wayne E. Oldendorph
Walter M. Olechna
Murray F. Olson
Gaylord C. Olson, Jr.
Jack E. Olson
Charles P. O'Neill, Jr.
John L. Onestinghel
John D. Orsburn
Frederick J. Osgood
Richard A. Oudal
James E. Owen
Richard E. Owen
Eric H. Oxboel
Gary V. Paddock
Harry N. Paduano, Jr.
Bruce D. Page
Charles W. Page, Jr.
Peter M. Pandolfi
Branche J. Parker
Michael W. Parker
Richard S. Parodi
Thomas L. Parry, Jr.
Jerry L. Parsons
Edward J. Pasahow
Bohdan Y. Paschyn
James G. Pastorius,
Jr.
Wesley F. Patience,
Jr.
John W. Patterson
Robert E. Patterson
Charles B. Payson
Jay W. Pease
Carl A. Pelzer, Jr.
Philip C. Perine
James K. Pernini
Robert A. Perron
Paul E. Perrone
Bradford K. Perry
James H. Perry, Jr.
Eric L. Peterson
Richard S. Peterson
Kenneth W. Pettigrew
Robert H. Pewett
Morgan S. Pirnie
Harry P. Planchon,
Jr.
Michael F. Plumkett
Walter E. Pollock III
Ernest H. Pomerantz
Bernard B. Poore
Thomas L. Potter
Robert R. Powell
Craig D. Pozzi
Jay L. Press
Joseph M. Price
Thomas L. Price
Rudolph P. Price, Jr.
William H. Prouty
Allen F. Pulk
Gareth D. Quale
Norman C. Radder
Allie J. Ralston
Clayton R. Ranskill
Richard C. Ranes
James R. Ratliff
Richard R. Ratzlaff
Jerry W. Rayfield
David W. Read
Robert A. Reardon
William P. Reberick
John P. Reberger
- Russell Reddoch
Philip F. Rehbock
Walter J. Reid, Jr.
Robert A. Reineke
Charles D. Reite
David J. Reitmeyer
Robert H. Reller
John P. Ribka
John W. Richardson
Charles A. Riggs
Gary I. Roberts
William R. Roberts, Jr.
John E. Robertson IV
Millard L. Robertson,
Jr.
Robert E. Robertson
III
Matthew G. Rode
Richard A. Rollins
Richard B. Romney
Leonard H. Ronnie, Jr.
David R. Roth
Dexter R. Rowell
Marvin J. Rozner
William J. Ruhe, Jr.
Peter K. Rumely
Charles E. Russell
Bruce A. Ryan
Edward J. Ryan, Jr.
Allan E. Rypka
Thomas W. Sampson
James E. Sanders III
Peter G. Sarafian
Joel R. Sartoris
Charles J. Savage
Richard V.
Schermerhorn
Roger E. Schlechte
Carl H. Schmitt
Stuart O. Schmitt
Randolph E. Schnabel
Carl E. Schneeberger
David D. Schoeff
Dean A. Schofield
Russell C. Scholl, Jr.
Charles F. Schomann
III
Thomas A. Schroeffel
Robert J. Schweers, Jr.
David T. Scott
Kenneth E. Scott
Patrick R. Scott
Joel S. Seffel
Murphy A. Sewall
Richard A. Sewell
William A. Shannon
III
Jerry L. Sharp
David F. Sheaff
George T. Sheffer
Robert E. Sherman
Andrew M. Shields
Ronald Y. Shigetani
Ronald E. Shriver
John R. Shultz
William L. Shumate
William M. Siddens
Bradley W. Simmons
Glen L. Sjoblom
William J. Slaughter
III
Robert S. Slifka
William T. Sloan, Jr.
Frederick K. Small-
wood
David O. Smith
J. J. Palmer Smith
John W. Smith
Ralph F. Smith
Robert I. Smith
William T. Smith III
William G. Smither
Gerald C. Snell
Ivan J. Snyder, Jr.
Keith R. Snyder
Stanley J. Snyder, Jr.
Robert W. Spellman,
Jr.
Charles H. Spence, Jr.
George M. Spilseth
David A. Spina
- Fredrik H. Spruiten-
burg
William L. Stahl, Jr.
Sammy D. Stair
Kevin T. Staley
David W. Stamps
Sam R. Stanbery, Jr.
Paul M. Stanford
William G. Stanley
Russell B. Starkey, Jr.
Douglas R. Starritt
John M. Stebbins
Robert S. Stephens
Daniel M. Sternberg
Edward M. Steudel, Jr.
Robert P. Stevens
Wilbur T. Stevens,
Jr.
Clement O. Steven-
son, Jr.
Joseph N. Stineman
Richard J. Streeter
*Terrance L. Stringer
John R. Suckow
Alfred H. Suhr
David J. Sullivan
James J. Sullivan
Herbert F. Swanson,
Jr.
Roger B. Swift
*Kelly F. Swindle, Jr.
Daniel N. Swinford
Harley H. Swink
Wayne J. Switzer
Dennis A. Tabel
Alexander A. Taday,
Jr.
John H. Talbot, Jr.
Daniel R. Talhelm
William W. Talley II
Clark M. Taylor
Keith A. Taylor
James T. Tedder, Jr.
Robert J. Terhune
Gerald A. Theisen
Douglas J. Thiel
Terry N. Thies
Glenn R. Thomas
James R. Thomas, Jr.
Albert F. Thomason
James A. Thompson
Roy W. Thompson
Ronald C. Tipper
Gary H. Tobey
John H. Todd
Gordon V. Tollefson
Alfred C. Tollison, Jr.
John T. Toohy
Donald A. Tortorice
Robert N. Tracy, Jr.
David M. Treadwell
J. Forrest G. Trembley
Allen J. Trucano
Richard P. Trumpler
Richard P. Tull
James F. Tune
George E. Turner
James E. Turner, Jr.
Laurence H. Turner,
Jr.
- The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:
- David G. Bezanilla
Jerry W. Billee
Robert E. Borton, Jr.
Faxon D. Chapin, Jr.
Thomas M. Cribbin
Martin J. Cross
James M. David
Joseph M. Doares, Jr.
Victor F. Duggins II
*Herbert E. Fish III
Kenneth M. Gladstone
Emmett W. Grandy
III
Robert C. Heim
*Bruce A. Hopkins
Frederick T. Jaffin, Jr.
- Thomas W. Turner
Daniel T. Twomey
William D. Tyson
Jerry L. Unrau
Anthony S. Vadopalas
Timothy L. Vaill
John M. Vanasek
James I. Vanliere
Kenton W. Vanlue
Pieter K. Vanwinkle
Douglas E. Veum
Russell T. Vickers
Randall W. Vittek
Edward P. Vollertsen
III
Ernst P. Vollmer
Robert B. Vosilius
John A. Waeltz
Frederick P. Wales
Francis A. Walker
Francis D. Walker III
Robert F. Walker
Ronald E. Walkington
Leonard D. Walter
Frederick F. Wanga-
ard, Jr.
Jimmy D. Warfield
George T. Wasleski,
Jr.
Mitchell L. Watson
Peter K. Watt
Ben A. Weaver
Harry C. Weber
William R. Welch
David R. Wesley
Howard V. West
Charles H. Whelan,
Jr.
Albert E. Whitehead
David G. Whitebourne
Jeffrey Wilk
Adrian R. Wilkins
Harry R. Wilkinson
David I. Williams
Donald E. Williams
Keener T. Williams
William H. Williams,
Jr.
Thomas A. Willis
Jack W. Wilson
Frank G. Winant
John C. Winguist
Henry R. Wismer
John E. Wohlfel
Neil F. Wood
Jerry F. Woolett
Douglas F. Wright
John R. Wright
John T. Wright
Robert E. Wright
Bruce N. Yarborough
Hugh W. Yarbrough
Gary A. Young
Gerry A. Young
Joe E. Young
James J. Zabritski
Jacob H. Zakarian
Robert J. Zimmer
John T. Zohlen

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John E. Bingham	Richard E. Pietrzykowski
Michael D. Christian	George S. Renshaw
James G. Fernald	Jack W. Samford
Gordon D. Helyer	Gerald J. Sieren
Michael G. Jensen	Duane R. Smith
Robert E. Lutz, Jr.	Roger B. Spencer
Robert J. Myshka	Winfred D. Vallance

*Fred J. Bice (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in the line as previously nominated and confirmed, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Robert W. Browning (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William L. Anderson, Jr.
George A. Playford
David M. Reeves

Lynn E. Leffler (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Van Melvin, warrant officer, to be a permanent chief warrant officer, W-2, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Seth E. Anderson, Jr.	Thomas B. Janter
George L. Bass, Jr.	Charles M. Jenkins
Howard S. Berg	Alfred N. Karickhoff
Robert A. Bielinski	Thaddeus E. Kelly
Ronald C. Bloodworth	James E. Kopp
Sydney D. Bogart	Hunter C. Leake III
Peteris Bormanis	Lloyd L. Leider, Jr.
Benjamin C. Bowen	Daniel B. Lestage
Ronald E. Bullock	Kenneth G. Magee
Robert J. Campbell	James R. McMillian
Herbert L. Cares	Kenneth H. Messner
John W. Chidsey, Jr.	James E. Moorman, Jr.
James J. Coatsworth	James R. Moyes
Richard J. Corbett, Sr.	Terence J. O'Toole
Daniel M. DeYoung	Stanley M. Patterson
Richard E. DuBois	Sam L. Pool
John R. Dunkelberg	Kenneth L. Raulston, Jr.
Frank E. Ehrlich	Larry D. Reed
Edward A. Ellis	David M. Reeves
John B. Emery, Jr.	Elster D. Roberts
Edwin H. Engert, Jr.	David I. Rosen
Stuart S. Fleming, Jr.	Kenneth R. Roth
Donald G. Gallup	Joel E. Sherlock
Roger L. Gilbertson	Rayburn R. Skoglund
Frank J. Gillen, Jr.	Walter H. Snider, Jr.
Howard D. Gunlock	Jerry C. Sutkamp
Robert B. Harrison	Britton E. Taylor
Ronald M. Hughes	Charles W. Toup
Lawrence G. Hunsicker	Dennis H. Wessels
David H. Jackson	Reginald D. Wheat
George T. Jamarik, Jr.	Eugene J. Wolski

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John E. Abbott	Edward P. Andersen
John R. Afinowicz	John N. Anderson
Robert J. Ailes	William L. Anderson, Jr.
Gordon R. Alena	

Curtis R. Baker	Ernest W. Hunt, Jr.
Don B. Bane	William B. Jackson
Anthony Barone	Clifford J. Jeremiah
Sylvester Barrington	James D. Johannes
Stanley L. Bartley	Francis D. Keenan, Jr.
Earl D. Baxter	Denils L. Keleher
Donald D. Bell	Leon R. Kelley
Anthony P. Belmont	Dan A. Kelly
Charles H. Bercier, Jr.	"R" R. Kenner
William F. Bigham	Gerard F. Kenny
Harold "W" Blevins	Peter T. Kirchner
Bruce R. Blome	John L. Kitzmiller
John E. C. Bocker	Raymond W. Kloforn
William J. Boehmle	George L. Koomos, Jr.
Robert L. Bonsanti	Kevin B. Lake
Adam G. Brandau, Jr.	William R. Lamb
Roger W. Brassel	Alan M. Larimer
David A. Brian	Robert C. Lecher
William H. Brigance	Lewis H. Lipsius
Robert B. Brigden	Paul A. LoCascio
Robert F. Brill	Michael J. Logan
Jim R. Browning	James T. Love, Jr.
Kenneth T. Buckley	Louis N. Ludington
Robert A. Bullock	George A. Lussier
Horace E. Buzhardt	John R. Lyons
Doyle E. Campbell	John W. Mace
Dudley K. Campbell	Thomas A. MacLean
Anthony A. Cassens, Jr.	Bruce A. Mallin
Carlton L. Chambers III	Harry A. Mangold
James W. Cole III	Edward C. Mattison
Thad F. Connally	Martin E. McKenney
Taylor I. Cook	Robert T. McKinlay, Jr.
Ted A. Cook	William E. McNally
Bernard J. Cordes	Thomas B. Merritt
James H. Covey	John M. Mertus
Wilton W. A. Cox	Karl V. Metz, Jr.
Alvin H. Crawford	David E. Miller
William G. Crawford	John P. Miller
Billy B. Crowell	Donald S. Minckler
Samuel L. D'Amato, Jr.	Richard Y. Mitsunaga
Jerome H. Davis	Frank A. Munden, Jr.
Timothy J. Davis	John F. Murphy
Donald A. Deinlein	Bruce A. Naylor
Robert D. de la Fuente	Louis T. Nielson
Paul T. DiGaudio	Frederick C. Norcross
Herbert S. Dodge	Clifford T. O'Connell
James B. Edwards III	Michael A. O'Keefe
Wilbur F. Eich III	Benjamin C. Olliff, Jr.
William L. Ekman	James H. Oury
Jerry E. Enis	Ralph G. Owen
Stanley A. Englund	Stanley M. Patterson
Richard H. Fair	James H. Patterson, Jr.
Anthony E. Fathman	James P. Perry
Lewis J. Fisher, Jr.	Roger A. Potter
Thomas H. Fisher	Ralph F. Principle
James M. Fitts, Jr.	Willard R. Prouty
William C. Flanagan, Jr.	Stephen C. Pruyn
George E. Fleming	Gene H. Purvis
John R. Fletcher	Charles N. Reed III
James R. Fowler	Delbert L. Remy
Lynn R. Frary	Glen V. Rice
Colin M. Freeman	Roderick P. Robertson
David B. Gillis	Donald M. Robinson
Robert L. Gingell	William D. Roche, Jr.
Barry Goldman	William A. J. Ross
Daniel H. Golwyn	William A. Scaring
Edward F. Good	Wendelin W. Schaefer
Dennis B. Goodman	Jenkins L. Schley
John E. Grasinger	Paul A. Selecky
Richard G. Grassy, Jr.	Larry J. Severson
Cecil D. Grimes, Jr.	Robert M. Seymour
James A. Grimes	Charlie W. Shaeffer, Jr.
John M. Grollmus	James O. Shaw
Frank R. Gudas	William D. Shea
James W. Ham	Ernest L. Simms
Ronald L. Hamm	Daniel C. Sismore
Kenneth R. Hansen	Ronald L. Smits
Terry J. Happel	Joseph P. Smyth
John M. Harrelson III	Harold L. Spencer
Daniel T. Harrington	Robert H. Spratt
John E. Hill	Richard D. Stevenson
Larry W. Hill	Regis T. Storch
William M. Hinz	Eugene S. Strout
James J. Houser	Robert M. Taxman
Robert L. Houts	Stephen C. Telatnik
John K. Howe, Jr.	Joel D. Todino
	Frank A. Trefny
	Ricardo J. Trevino

David E. Ulmer	Ackerman C. Williams, Jr.
Peter V. Van Tassel	Bernard M. Williams
Leonard L. Vertuno	George A. Williams
Richard P. Wagner	Samuel W. Williams
George G. Wells	Tom V. Willis, Jr.
Gerald M. West	Orville D. Wilson, Jr.
Harold D. West, Jr.	Walter S. Yourchek, Jr.
David O. Westmark, Sr.	David C. Ziegler
Robert H. Wheelock	Jack E. Zimmerman
James E. Wilkerson	

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Herschel M. Timmons, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Henry D. Barratt	Joaquin D. Pereira
Duard L. Beebe	Roger P. Pilcher
John R. Bell	Herbert F. Posey
Roderick E. Benton	Thomas R. Preston
James M. Chance	H. L. Redding
Roger J. Claus	Richard R. Reuschling
Charles E. Conway, Jr.	Donald J. Robinson II
Joseph C. Dangler	Anthony J. Scaran
Francis T. Dettrey	George R. Schipper
Wilson R. Dodge	Frederick W. Schroeder
Joseph J. Dzielski	Delmas D. Sharp, Jr.
Elbert A. Foster	Kenneth E. Shelton
Marshall M. Grice, Jr.	Billy E. Simpson
Leon A. Guimond	Alan T. Snyder
William P. Hamilton	Jerry L. Stricker
Billie E. Hicks	Frank D. Strong
Fred L. James	William E. Tisdale
Herbert C. Johnson	William G. Van Zanten, Jr.
Robert L. Jones, Jr.	David B. Werner
James A. Kinniger	Theodore L. Whisler
Ronald C. Kraus	David F. Winecoff
L. J. Lott	Anthony A. Zadravec
Kenneth R. Maddox	
Enrique A. Mauri	
Joseph R. Paquette	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ronald L. Allen	Moffatt F. Wylie
Henry W. Austin	Paul E. Rudeen, Jr.
Earle G. Breeding, Jr.	William R. Griggs
Jack R. Brinker	John W. Raymond
James R. Coughlan	John P. Caynak
Ronald V. Debrincat	James E. Selway
Lawrence L. Downey	Ronald F. Thomson
James H. Pinnick	David L. Lawson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George W. Atteberry	Robert L. Babos
Dennis A. Cavagnaro	Allen L. Powers
Robert F. Rodgers	James D. Gilliard
David A. Villeneuve	Benny M. McKenzie
John T. Radzyminski	Richard C. Bradfield
Thomas L. Elser	Edward F. Kubik, Jr.
James L. Losey	Edward L. Green
Edward R. Doane	Terry C. Jackson
John G. Flynn	Glenn O. Kennedy, Jr.
Warren A. Culpepper	William C. Reed, Jr.
Robert G. Whaley	William J. Feind
John R. Fritsch	James P. Crowley
Delbert H. Dupont	Joseph G. Dentz
Herbert E. Hoppmeier, Jr.	Jerry L. Lathrop
William F. Tremper	Zane B. Fisher

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John B. Caskey	Alan W. Hitchens
John B. Crelk, Jr.	Sammy R. Claxton

NOTE.—* Indicates interim appointment issued.